

Essays in aid of a Comparative Grammar of the Gaurian Languages.—By
REV. A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE, D. Ph. Tübingen, Professor of San-
srit, Jay Náráyan's College, Benares.

(Continued from Journal for 1872, Pt. I, p. 174.)

Essay IV.

On the Inflexional base.

In the third essay I attempted to collect all the facts and phenomena presented by the various Gaurian languages in regard to their inflexional base. These facts were analysed and some general principles deduced from them. Two of these general principles require a more special consideration ; and this will be the subject of the present essay. It has been shown in the 3rd essay, that the inflexional base may (under certain circumstances) assume a two-fold form ; viz. a *direct* form and an *oblique* form. One of the two general principles is closely connected with the *direct* form, the other with the *oblique* form.

One result of the previous enquiry has been to show that the inflexional bases of the Gaurian languages are divided into two great classes according as they admit or do not admit an *oblique form*, and accordingly they were divided into 1., the Prákritic, and 2., the Gaurian (including Gaurian proper and Sanskritic) nouns, *i. e.*, into those which have retained traces of the Prákrit *organic* declension, and those which have emancipated themselves of it altogether. This conclusion, however, was mainly dependent upon the truth of the identity of the *oblique form with the organic genitive of the Prákrit*. This principle I shall try to establish now.

Another result of the previous enquiry has been to show that while some inflexional bases retain in their *direct form* the original Prákrit termination अ, others reduce it to उ or अ. This difference was explained by the theory that the former are derived from a *particular* Prákrit base ending in अक (or इक), while the latter are derived from the *general* base in अ. The truth of this principle will be the second point I shall endeavour to establish. But the facts upon which the proof of both, this and the other principle, depends, are so closely intertwined, that it will not be possible to keep both enquiries altogether distinct.

It is a well known fact, that in Sanskrit the genitive is not uncommonly substituted for the dative, though it possesses an *organic* dative ; (cf. Pálini 2, 3. 5., M. Williams's Sanskrit Grammar §, 816, A. p. 353). In Prákrit this rule has become absolute (see Cowell's Prákrit Prakása VI. 64.) ; and necessarily so ; for it has lost the *organic* dative altogether ; and not possessing one, it is obliged either to paraphrase it (by postpositions, e. g.,

प्रति, कृते, अर्थे, etc.), or to substitute (according to the precedent of Sanskrit) the genitive. The latter is on the whole the more common course.* The Gaurian languages which have received their grammatical system from the Prákrit (or, at all events, not from the Sanskrit), it is manifest, cannot possess an organic dative; and, it is more than probable, a priori, that what passes in them for the dative is (according to the precedent of Prákrit) either a paraphrase of the dative or a substituted (organic) genitive. The former course, *viz.* to paraphrase the dative by postpositions, as is well known, has become the almost universal rule in the Gaurian.† The only exception (barring isolated instances in other languages) is in the Maráthí. This language possesses by the side of the ordinary paraphrastic datives (formed with the postpositions ला, प्रत, जबल, करितां, etc., cf. Manual, pp. 17, 18,) a form of the dative ending in स which has all the appearance of being an *organic* case-form; e. g., dative of देव God is देवास (besides देवाला, etc.); of कवि poet it is कवीस (besides कवीला, etc.); of गुरु it is गुरुस (besides गुरुला, etc.). This dative in स is generally admitted (cf. Manual, pp. 132, 133), and can easily be shown to be nothing but the *organic genitive* of the Prákrit. For the genitive of देव, कवि and गुरु in Prákrit is देवस्स, कविस्स, गुरुस्स (cf. Prák. Prak. V. 8, 15). Now I have already explained in the 2nd Essay that in the later Prákrit and in Gaurian, one of two similar compounded consonants is elided and the preceding vowel lengthened (see Prák. Prak. III, 58.). Accordingly the genitive of the pronoun जो (base ज) in Prákrit is masc. जस्स or जास, fem. जस्सा or जासे (or जाए); of the fem. base जि the gen. is जिस्सा or जीसे (or जीए); see Prák. Prak. VI. 6, 6.‡ According to the

* Examples from the Sakuntalá :

का तुमं विसज्जिद्वस्स रन्धिव्वस्स वा ॥ i. e.

Skr. का त्वं विसृष्टव्याय रोद्धव्याय वा ॥

Or. अणुजाणाहि सो उडअगमणस्स ॥ i. e.

अनुजानोहि न उडजगमनाय ॥

From the Uttara Rámacharita :

णमो तपोधणाणं णमो रज्जुलदेअदाणं ॥ i. e.

Skr. नमः तपोधनेभ्यः नमो रघुकुलदेवताभ्यः ॥

Or. अहिअदरं मम महाराओ कुविस्सदि ॥ i. e.

Skr. अधिकतरं मच्चं महाराजः कोपिष्यति ॥

† The regular process of glottic development from Sanskrit to Gaurian is here, worth noting; the dative is expressed in the

Sanskrit by the dative or genitive;

Prákrit by the — genitive, or paraphrase;

Gaurian by the ——— paraphrase.

‡ The same is the case with the Mágadhí Prákrit genitive in आह; e. g., Skr. पुरुषस्य is in M. Prák. पुलिशाह. Here ह is the modification of an original स, so that पुलिशाह stands for पुलिशास and this for पुलिशास्स, just as देवास for देवस्स which in M. Prák. would be देवाह (cf. Pr. Prak. XI, 12.)

analogy of the pronominal forms जास for जस्स, जीसे for जिस्सा, the Prákrit genitives देवस्स, कविस्स, गुरुस्स, etc., become in the Gaurian देवास, कवीस, गुरुस. etc., i. e., the forms which we see in the Maráthí. The original genitive character of the Maráthí dative in स is further proved by the dative formed by means of the so-called postposition साठीँ; e. g., देव has a dative देवासाठीँ besides देवास or देवा ला; or कवि has कवीसाठीँ beside कवीस or कवीला; गुरु has गुरुसाठीँ beside गुरुस and गुरुला. These forms (as देवासाठीँ, कवीसाठीँ, गुरुसाठीँ, etc.) have always been derived thus; देवा (base) + साठीँ (postposition), कवी + साठीँ, गुरु + साठीँ under the mistaken notion, that as देवा, कवी, गुरु, etc. are the bases in all the other cases (e. g., instr. देवा + नेँ, dative देवा + ला, abl. देवा + ह्न, etc.), the same base must be contained also in the forms देवासाठीँ, etc. But it has never been shown what the meaning and derivation of the word साठीँ might be. The truth is, that साठीँ is no word at all; and that the forms देवासाठीँ, etc., have been wrongly divided. They ought to be separated thus; देवास (base) and अठीँ postposition, कवीस + अठीँ, गुरुस + अठीँ, etc. The postposition अठीँ is the Prákrit and Gaurian equivalent of the Sanskrit अर्थे which, however, in the Gaurian may also be modified to आयीँ and hence the Maráthí has beside देवास + अठीँ also देवा + अर्थीँ (compare Skr. स्थाने which becomes in Mar. and Beng. ठाईँ, in Hindí and Panj. ताईँ). Hence देवासाठीँ, i. e. देवास अठीँ) stands for Skr. देवस्य अर्थे or Prak. देवस्स अठम्मि; again कवीस अठीँ is = Prák. कविस्स अठम्मि = Skr. कवेर् अर्थे; again गुरुस अठीँ = Prák. गुरुस्स अठम्मि, Skr. गुरोर् अर्थे.

So far then it is plain that the Maráthí dative ending in स is in reality the *organic genitive* of the Prákrit.* Now in old Maráthí poetry another dative form has been preserved which ends in आ, e. g., ईश्वर God, dative ईश्वरा (see Manual, p. 138). There can be no doubt that this form in आ is but a further modification or corruption of the more original and more perfect form in स; that, e. g., ईश्वरा is a curtailment of ईश्वरास. It may have arisen thus; in the Gaurian a final short vowel is not pronounced, so that the

* In the oldest Hindí of Chand Bardái instances of this *organic genitive* in स, which in the modern Maráthí only occurs in the sense of the dative, are still found with their original Gen. sense; e. g.,

तास राज समीपं ।	Or. रति करन क्रीलनह राज थाह ।
रहें नट विद्या उचारं ॥	न न हंस धीर न न सुषुष ताह ॥
i. e. Skr. तस्य राज्ञः समीपे etc.	Skr. नहि मन धीरं नहि सुखं तस्य ॥ etc.
Sasivrittá Kathá XXV. 16.	Ibid. XXV. 36.
Or. सोमवंस जह्व व्रपति ।	Or. ता ग्रह सु पात्र अनेक गुन ।
देवगिर जसि जीस ॥	रह सु तहां निसि दीह पर ॥
Skr. देवगिरिर् यशो यस्य etc.	Skr. तस्य गृहे कन्या अनेकगुणवती etc.
Ibid. XXV. 15.	Ibid. XXV. 16.

consonant which precedes it, is virtually the final of the word; now most probably the consonant स of the dative first changed to ह (a change, which is supported by the Mágadhí Prákrit genitive in आह, see note on page 60 and Prák. Prak. XI. 12.), and then the ह becoming the virtual final sound of the word was dropped; thus ईश्वरास become first ईश्वराह (or virtually ईश्वराह्) and finally ईश्वरा. Any one by pronouncing both ईश्वराह् and ईश्वरा, may see how easily one passes into the other. It follows thus, that the dative form in आ, being merely a modification of the fuller dative form in आस, is also really the *organic genitive* of the Prákrit.

Now this genitive form in आ which has been preserved in the dative of the old Maráṭhí, has been lost in modern Maráṭhí, but it is preserved in the latter as well as in the former as the *inflexional base of all cases formed by post-positions*, e. g. देव, "God," has old and modern dative देवास, old dative देवा, (old and modern) instr. देवा नैँ, dative देवा ला, abl. देवा ह्न, genitive देवा चा. So far then it is proved, that the *oblique form* in आ of the inflexional base of Maráṭhí nouns in अ is identical with the *organic genitive* of the Prákrit. But further it is manifest that as the nature of the Maráṭhí dative form in ईस and ऊस (e. g., कवीस, गुरुस) is identical with that of the dative form in आस (e. g., देवास), so the nature of the *oblique forms* in ई and ऊ (of the inflexional base of Maráṭhí nouns in इ and उ, as कवी चा gen. of कवि, गुरु चा gen. of गुरु) must be identical with that of the *oblique form* in आ of the inflexional base of nouns in अ; and in the same manner as the form in आ arose from that in आस, so the form in ई and ऊ must have arisen from those in ईस and ऊस. It follows, therefore, that the *oblique forms* in ई and ऊ of the inflexional base of Maráṭhí nouns in इ and उ are *identical* with the *organic genitive* of the Prákrit; that is, that, e. g., the *oblique form* कवी of the noun कवि is identical with the Prák. genitive कविस्स and गुरु with गुरुस्स, etc.

If, as has been now shown, the *oblique form* of the inflexional base of all nouns in अ, इ, and उ (*i. e.*, by far the greatest part of the whole number of nouns) is identical with the Prákrit genitives, this fact raises the presumption that the *oblique form* of all remaining inflexional bases will be of the same nature. We will now take the different kinds of *oblique forms* of inflexional bases in Maráṭhí and afterwards in the other Gaurian languages one by one and show that that is really the case.

a. The inflexional base of all Maráṭhí nouns (masc. fem. and neut.) in इ and उ, and of all Mar. nouns (masc. and neut.) in अ has an *oblique form*, respectively, in ई and ऊ and आ. These, as has been already proved, are Prákrit genitives.

b. The inflexional base of *feminine* nouns in अ, has an *oblique form* either in ई or in ए. Those nouns which have an *oblique form* in ई, are, as I have shown in Essay III., really feminine nouns in इ. They belong,

therefore, to the former class, and their *oblique form* in ई is a *Prákrit genitive*. Those nouns which have an *oblique form* in ए are, as has also been shown in Essay III, really *Prákrit feminine nouns* in आ. The *Prákrit genitive* of these nouns ends in आए, which in Gaurian might become अए (the final आ being reduced to अ as in the Nom. and Acc. cases), and this, finally, is contracted by regular Sandhi (cf. *Prák. Prak.* IV. 1.) into ए; e. g., जीभ *tongue* has gen. जीभे; in *Prákrit* it is जीभा (or जीहा = *Skr.* जिह्वा, cf. *Prák. Prak.* I. 17, III. 54); Gen. जीभाए, in Gaurian जीभए, contracted जीभे (as in *Bangálí* बाघ + एर = बाघेर, Gen. of बाघ tiger).

c. All *Maráthí* nouns ending in consonants (masc. fem. or neut.) are treated as ending in अ, and hence the *oblique forms* of their inflexional bases end either in आ or in ई or in ए, and are, therefore, *Prákrit genitives* formed according to the analogy of the real nouns in अ. All these nouns in consonants are either *Sanskritic* or foreign; but never derived from the *Prákrit*, as no *Prákrit* word may end in a consonant, see *Pr. Prak.* IV. 6—II. 18. Their treatment has been explained in Essay III.

d. The inflexional bases of *Maráthí* nouns (masc. or fem.) in ई, ऊ, ए, ऐ, औ, औ, and neuter nouns in ऊ have no *oblique form* at all. As regards the few exceptional masc. nouns in ई and ऊ and neuter nouns in ऊँ, see the next paragraph.

e. There remain the masc. nouns in आ to which correspond fem. nouns in ई and the neuter nouns in ईँ; the masc. nouns in ई to which correspond fem. nouns in ई and the neuter nouns in ईँ; and the masc. nouns in ऊ to which correspond the fem. nouns in ऊ and the neuter nouns in ऊँ. The inflexional base of the first two kinds of nouns has an *oblique form* in या (masc. and neuter) and in ये (fem.). The inflexional base of the third kind has an *oblique form* in वा (masc. and neuter) and वे (fem.). The explanation of these *oblique forms* is more complicated. They are, as I shall show, the organic genitives of *Prákrit* nouns formed by the affix क (masc. and neuter,) and का (fem.). It will be necessary to dispose first of the latter question; viz. the presence in the Gaurian languages of a class of nouns which are descended from *Prákrit* nouns formed by the peculiar *Prákrit* affix क (cf. *Pr. Prak.* IV, 25.) Here I will only draw attention to an important coincidence. Masculine and neuter nouns in अ have (as has been shown) an *oblique form* in आ (being the corruption of the *Prákrit* genitive in अस्स). Their corresponding fem. nouns in अ have an *oblique form* in ए (being a corruption of their *Prákrit* genitive in आए). Similarly we have here masc. and neuter *oblique forms* in या and वा and their corresponding feminines in ये and वे. The conclusion may be drawn that the masc. nouns in आ and ई and the neuter nouns in ईँ and ईँ which yield the *oblique form* in या, were originally masc. and neuter nouns in य or यं = इअ or इअं = इक or इक; and that their *oblique form* in या is a cor-

ruption of a Prákrit genitive in यस्स (=इअस्स=इकस्स). Again, that the feminine nouns in ई which correspond to the masc. nouns in आ and ई and to the neuter nouns in एँ and ईँ, and which yield the *oblique form* in ये, were originally feminine nouns in या=इआ=इका; and that their *oblique form* in ये is a corruption of a Prákrit genitive in याए = इआ = इकार. Similarly it may be concluded that the masc. nouns in ऊ and neuter nouns in ऊँ which yield the *oblique form* in वा, were originally masc. and neuter nouns in व or वं, *i. e.*, in उअ or उअं = उक or उकं; and that their *oblique form* in वा is a corruption of a Prákrit Genitive in वस्स = उअस्स = उकस्स; and again that the feminine nouns in ऊ which correspond to the masc. nouns in ऊ and neuter nouns in ऊँ, and which yield the *oblique form* in वे, were originally fem. nouns in वा, *i. e.*, in उआ = उका; and that their *oblique form* in वे is a corruption of a Prákrit genitive in वाए = उआए = उकार. As regards the *oblique form* in ए or आ of the inflexional base of certain nouns in the Hindí-class Gaurian languages, their case is exactly like that of the last mentioned class of Maráthí words. The two classes of nouns correspond to each other in the two classes of Gaurian languages, e. g., Hindí घोड़ा *horse*, obl. घोड़े, is in Maráthí घोड़ा, obl. घोड़्या. And their *oblique forms* must therefore have the same nature, and must admit of the same explanation; *viz.* that they are the organic genitive of particular Prákrit bases formed by the affix. क (*i. e.*, ending in अक).

The evidences showing that there is in Gaurian a class of nouns, which are derived from Prákrit bases formed by means of the peculiar, *pleonastic* affix क, are the following. In the first place, it may be remarked, that all Sanskrit words which have a base in अक (*i. e.*, formed by the affix क) and have passed into the Gaurian through the Prákrit, terminate in the Gaurian in ओ(औ) or आ, and not in अ or उ; e. g., *horse* is Skr. घोटक, nom. sing. घोटकः, Prák. घोडको or घोडओ, Gaurian घोड़ो or घोड़ा;—Skr. कटकः *stiff*, Pr. कडाको or कडओ, Gaurian कड़ो or कड़ा;—Skr. चम्पकः the *champaka tree*, Prák. चंपका or चंपओ, Gaurian चंपो or चंपा;—Skr. पालकः *keeper*, Prák. वालओ, Gaurian वालो or वाला (an affix);—Skr. धारकः *holder*, Pr. धारओ or हारओ, Gaurian हारो or हारा (an affix).—There are only a small number of nouns of this kind. But on the other hand all Sanskrit nouns, the base of which ends in अ only, and which have passed into the Gaurian through the Prákrit, terminate in the Gaurian either in ओ (आ) or in अ (उ), evidently according as they did or did not assume, in their passage through Prákrit, the affix क; e. g., *sweet* in Gaurian (Hindí) is both मीठ and मीठा; both represent the Skr. मिष्टः; but Skr. मिष्टः may be represented in the Prák. by मिष्टो (*i. e.*, मिष्टः) and by मिष्टओ (*i. e.*, मिष्टकः); now Prák. मिष्टो becomes the Gaurian मीठ, and Prákrit मिष्टओ becomes the Gaurian मीठो (मीठा). Again *heat* is in Skr. घर्मः, and *pot* घटः, both having bases in अ. In Prák. they may assume the forms घग्मा or घग्मओ and घडो

or घड्या. But of the former pair the form घम्पो became the usual one while of the latter pair घड्यो was the usual one. Accordingly we find in the Gaurian *heat* to be घाम, but *pot* to be घड़ो or घड़ा. These examples might be multiplied indefinitely.

Next, Sanskrit *masculine* nouns which have a base in अ exhibit in the Gaurian a two-fold termination. They either end in ओ (ओ, आ) or in अ (उ). But a very analogous phenomenon may be observed in Sanskrit neuter nouns in अ, with nom. sing. in अम्. They exhibit in the Gaurian a twofold termination ending either in अ or in औ, ऊँ, एँ, ईँ; e. g., Skr. गृहम् *house* = Gaur. घर; but Skr. कृतम् *done* = Gaur. केल (Mar.) or कीनौ or कियौ (Br. Bh.) or कीनूँ (Alw.); and Skr. मैत्रिकम् *pearl* Gaur. मोती (Mar.). Sometimes both forms occur in the same word as Skr. कदरम् *plantain* = Gaur. केल or केलूँ, and Skr. नारिकेलम् *cocoanut* = Gaur. नारल or नारली (Mar.). But observe the difference. The nom. sing. of those *masc.* nouns ends in Skr. in अः; this turns in Prākṛit into ओ; and this again, in Gaurian, is either retained unchanged ओ or reduced to अ(उ). All this is intelligible; from अः (= अम्) to ओ to अ, there is a direct progress of phonetic corruption, consistent with the glottic laws regulating the development of younger languages from an older one. But now in the other case; the nom. sing. of *neuter* nouns in Skr. is अं (= अम्) which remains in Prākṛit अं or becomes simply अ; in Gaurian the Prākṛit अं or अ is either reduced to (resp. remains) अ or is raised to औ, ऊँ, एँ, ईँ.* Now this is contrary to all principles of glottic development. By whatever other means languages may increase and reconstruct themselves; *phonetically* they disintegrate and *decrease* as they advance. The simple Prākṛit termination अ or अं can never by itself have been raised or increased to औ or ऊँ or एँ or ईँ. This is utterly inconceivable, nor will any reference to the accent help us here out of the difficulty. The accent might explain the absence of phonetic disintegration, where its presence would be expected, as, e. g., that the Prākṛit termination ओ remains in the Gaurian, in some cases, ओ, instead of being reduced to अ; (though even in this case, as I have shown in Essay III, the explanation by the help of the accent is quite inadequate); but it is quite unable to explain the presence of a phonetic increase which is contrary to glottic laws, according to which either phonetic disintegration or at least no change at all ought to have taken place. It

* E. g. Skr. गृहं, = Prāk. घरं or घर, = Gaur. घर. But Skr. कृतं, = Pr. कड or कडं, = Gaur. (Mar.) केलूँ; or Skr. कृतं, = Pr. कियं or कियं, = Gaur. (Br. B.) कियौ; or Skr. मैत्रिकं = Prāk. मैत्रियं = Gaur. (Mar.) मोती. Or in the same word Skr. कदरं, = Pr. केरं or केर = Gaur. केल or केलूँ (Mar.) or केला (H. Hindí); and Skr. नारिकेलं, = Pr. नारिएलं or नारिएल, = Gaur. (Mar.) नारल or नारली. In this last case it is especially obvious that the same Skr. or Prāk. form could not have been the immediate source of the two widely different Gaurian forms.

is evident the Gaurian neuter forms in औँ, ऊँ, ऐँ, ईँ, must be susceptible of such an explanation as accounts for the phonetic increase without shutting out the possibility of phonetic disintegration in these same forms.

I think a clue to the right interpretation of these neuters in औँ (Hindí Br. Bh.), औँ (Hindí Súra Dása), ऊँ (Hindí, Alw., and Maráthí), ऐँ (Gujarátí and Naipálí); ऐँ (Maráthí); ईँ (Maráthí) is given us by the Gaurian infinitives. Let us take, for example, the infinitive *to do* or *doing*. It is in the Low Hindí dialect of the Braj करनौँ, of Alwar करनूँ, of Súra Dása करनौँ; in Maráthí करणेँ, in Naipálí करनु (or करनुँ?). The common opinion, I believe, is that all these forms are verbal nouns formed by the Sanskrit affix अन, and that their original is the Sanskrit and Prákrit form करणं.* This, as has been shown in the preceding paragraph, is impossible, because it contradicts the glottic laws. Their origin must be a different one. In Maráthí the meaning of the infinitive is only one out of many, and that a subordinate one, of करणेँ and all words of this class. To express the infinitive it has a proper form in ऊँ, connected with, though not derived from, the Sanskrit infinitive in तुं. The proximate and principal meaning of करणेँ in Maráthí is that of the *Latin* gerund. But Maráthí possesses two forms of the gerund, one in ऐँ and another in वैँ; besides करणेँ it has also the form करावैँ; e. g., *incitement to act* is करण्या ची प्रेरणा and करावया ची प्रेरणा. Now if we turn to the Prákrit and Sanskrit we find the origin of these forms. We meet with two Sanskrit affixes forming gerunds, or part. fut. pass., of which latter the gerund is merely a particular usage; *viz.* अनीय and तव्य. In Prákrit these become अणीअ or अणिज्ज and तव्व (see Pr. Prák. II, 17. VII, 33.). Now it can easily be shown that these affixes will account for the two alternative forms of the gerund in Maráthí. The common Prákrit *prose* representative of the Sanskrit root कृ is कर (see Pr. Prák. XII, 15.). Of this root we obtain with the affix अणीअ the gerund करणीअ (= Skr. करणीय), and with the affix तव्व, the form करितव्व which is the more polished form (enjoined by the Pr. Prák. VII, 33.), or करतव्व (= Skr. कर्त्तव्य) which was probably the *vulgar* form of it. In either form (करितव्व or करतव्व) the medial त् would become elided (according to the ordinary rules of Prákrit), thus making करिअव्व or करअव्व (the forms given by Pr. Prák. VII, 33.). Next these forms become contracted by sandhi to करव्व,† and finally one of the two व's is elided (according to the Gaurian law explained in Essay II.), and the preceding short अ lengthened; thus we obtain the form

* Bopp (Comp. Grammar § 875) adopts this opinion but with much hesitation.

† Cowell in his Pr. Grammar, p. 68, gives from one MS. the form हसिब्वं or हसेव्व. If these are at all trustworthy, the analogous forms करिब्वं or करेव्वं exhibit a form very nearly identical with the present Maráthí form करावैँ and altogether identical with the Braj Bháshá gerund करिवौँ, on which more will be said further on.

कराव which is manifestly the base from which the Maráthí करावेँ is derived. Next take the alternative form करणीञ्च. The nom. sing. neuter of it is करणीञ्चं. Vararuchi's sūtra Pr. Prák. I, 18 shows that Prákrit has a tendency to shorten the vowel ई in such final syllables as ईञ्च (= ईय or ईक), etc. The following examples are there given; Skr. पानीञ्चं = Pr. पाणिञ्चं; Skr. द्वितीयं = Pr. दुइञ्चं; Skr. तृतीयं = Pr. तइञ्चं; Skr. अलीकं = Pr. अलिञ्चं, etc. We may well assume that in the vernacular Prákrit these vulgar forms, of which only a very few were admitted into the literary Prákrit, were much more general and regular; especially in the gerunds formed by the affix अनोय. Accordingly we may conclude that the nom. sing. neuter करणीञ्चं became करणिञ्चं or (with insertion of euphonic य्) करणियं.* Finally करणियं (or करणिञ्चं) becomes in Gaurian contracted to करणे. For ए is an extremely common substitute for any of the combinations इञ्च, इय, ईय, यञ्च, अय, both in Prákrit and Gaurian.† E. g. the syllable अय contained in all causal verbs becomes in Prákrit ए, as कारेदि or कारेइ for Skr. कारयति, etc. Again the Skr. कियत् and इयत् become in Prákrit केत् + इक (properly कियन्त् + इक) and एत् + इक (= इयन्त् + इक). Again in Gaurian (old Hindí) the Skr. Part. Past Act. affix इतवान्, which in Prákrit becomes इञ्चवन्तो or इञ्चञ्,‡ becomes एउ; as Skr. कथितवान्, Pr. कहिञ्चवन्तो or कहिञ्चञ्, Hindí कहेउ (in old Hindí of Chand Bárdái कहेव). Again in low Hindí the Braj Bháshá याकौ of him, याकौँ to him, यामेँ in him, corresponds to the Ganwári एकर, एको, एमे, etc. Again in Bangáli, in common conversation, a final or medial इया is contracted into ए (see Forbes' Bengali Gram. App. A. 4. p. 160. Shamachurn Sircar's Bengali Gram. p. 149, note 45.); e. g., धरिया becomes धरे, करनिया becomes करने. We shall meet with some more examples of this favorite contraction in the course of this Essay.§ Now the genitive of

* An example of this form we have perhaps in the following verse of Chand;

कर मोहि पल्लव भानियं ॥

चङ्गवान तो घरे हानियं ॥ Pr. Raj.

i. e. The cutting of the finger of my hand will be the destruction of thy house, oh Chahuván. The same form we have probably in the Bangáli nouns of agency in अनिया (cf. Shamachurn's Grammar, p. 149.); e. g., करनिया a doer = Naipáli करन्या = Hindí करने का or करनेवाला.

† By analogy, ओ is a substitution for the combinations उव, उया, वा, अव as Braj Bháshá वाकौ = Ganwári ओकर; Bangáli पटुवा in common conversation = पटो; cf. Skr. सुवर्णः = Pr. सुवलो, Gaur. सोना. But व is, as a rule, substituted by उ, as उच्यते for वच्यते; and य by इ; e. g. in old and low Hindí he is both यह and इह.

‡ Of the change of the termination वान् into ञ्च in Prákrit, I have found one example, in Mricchhakatí Act IV. p. 119, कुदोदे एत्तिञ्च विहवो = Skr. कुतस्ते एतावान् विभवः

§ Another example we have in Páli and Prákrit. In Páli the affix of the Instr. Abl., Dat. and Gen. of feminine nouns is या (or य). The corresponding affix in

the Prákrit base करणीञ्च would be करणीञ्चस्स. This form करणीञ्चस्स, according to the process already explained, would successively change to करणीञ्चास— करणीञ्चा or करणिञ्चा—करणा which last form is identical with the *oblique form* of the Maráthí करणेँ.

Then as regards the low Hindí forms for the Maráthí करणेँ; *viz.*, करनैँ करनोँ, करनूँ; the way how they are derived from the original Skr. करणीयं or Prák. करणीञ्च is, probably, this. It does not seem probable that the sounds औ, ओ, ऊ, are merely modifications of ए; at least I am not aware of any example of such a change of a terminal ए to औ or ओ or ऊ. But we have seen on the previous page how the Prákrit form करणीञ्च would colloquially change into करणिञ्चं. Now there are many instances which prove that for the vowel इ of the polished Prákrit the *vulgar* Prákrit dialects substituted the *broader* अ; e. g., in Maráthí we have as the termination of the past part. pass. the affix अल (as सुटला *got loose*) which stands for the Prákrit इञ्च or इत (see Pr. Prák. VII, 32); above we had the vulgar form करअञ्चं for the more polished form करिअञ्चं. Thus it is probable that instead of करणिञ्चं the vulgar dialect pronounced करणञ्चं or, with the euphonic य, करणयं. And finally करणञ्चं would become naturally contracted to करनैँ, of which करनोँ or करनूँ are merely dialectic variations. The first personal pronoun in the low Hindí of Braj हैँ ego (Alwarí and High Hindí हँ) affords a very good illustration of this change of the terminal अञ्चं to औँ. Its equivalent in Sanskrit is अहम् which in Prákrit becomes हं or हञ्चं (cf. Pr. Prák. VII, 40.). Now the form हं could not have yielded the Gaurian form हैँ; it could only have given ह, just as घरं *house* gives वर, but not घरौँ. Hence the original of हैँ must be the other form हञ्चं, and this violates no glottic law.* It may, therefore, be accepted as a law that the

Prákrit is ए; e. g., Páli कन्याय *by, from, to, of a virgin*, but in Prákrit कन्याए; Páli नदिया, Prák. णर्दए; Páli वधुया = Prák. व्हए. The Páli is here nearer to the Skr., where these forms would be respectively (genitive) कन्यायाः, नद्याः, वध्वाः. Similarly in the causal where the syllable अय is always contracted to ए in Prákrit, but only *optionally* in Páli; e. g., Skr. कारयति = Páli कारयति or क रेति = Prák. कारेदि or कारेइ. These and many other examples, especially the treatment of the medial consonants, prove that *phonetically* Páli occupies an intermediate position between Sanskrit and Prákrit.

See Dr. Mason's Páli Grammar, p. 105 and p. 61. 37.

* It should be observed also, that the Prákrit form हञ्चं stands for an original form हकं (*i. e.*, base ह + affix क). This is proved by the Mágadhí Prákrit form of ego हके or हगे (cf. Pr. Prák. ix, 9.) In Mágadhí, namely, the diphthong ए often stands in the place of the final syllable अं; e. g., in Mṛichchhakatí:

अइं तुए मुक्क ॥ *i. e.*

Skr. अइं त्वया मुक्तां ॥

sound अञ् may change to औँ ; and this conclusion is confirmed by the fact that the phonetic equivalent of अञ्, viz. अं, also changes into औँ ; e. g., the first pers. sing. pres. of the verb *to be* is in the Braj हैँ, in Alwári हँ (also high Hindí), in Jaipurí हूँ, in Naipáli हूँ (in Bangáli आइ). The original of these forms is the Prákrit अच्चास्मि (see Prák. Prak. XII, 19.), the substitute for the Sanskrit अस्मि (from the root अच्च् for अस्, just as गच्च् for गम्, इच्च् for इष्). The initial अ of अच्चास्मि is dropped, (just as in हं or हगे for अहम् or अहकम्), and the final इ becomes *quiescent* (according to the Gaurian rule, see Essay III.) Thus we have हाम् or हाँ (compare the Prákrit future; e. g., गमिस्सं for गमिष्यामि). This is modified to हौँ or हूँ ; next the aspirated palatal क् is reduced to the simple aspirate ह ; and thus we obtain हैँ or हँ. The *mode* of this change seems to be this, that the anuswára, being the substitute of an original labial nasal म्, is vocalised into the labial vowel उ ; at least this seems to be indicated by such Prákrit nouns as पाञ् (= Skr. पाद्), नाम, गाम, (= Skr. ग्राम) which in the Gaurian becomes पांव, नांव, गांव, (Hindí), or पाउँ, नाउँ, गाउँ, (Naipáli) ; both, in both Gaurian languages equally, are pronounced पैँ, नैँ, गौँ.

The Naipáli equivalent of the Hindí forms करनौँ and करनूँ is करनु. It approaches most nearly to the Alwári form करनूँ and must be considered as merely a modification of it (a reduction of the terminal long ऊ to short उ, so common in Gaurian). It has its exact counterpart in Gujarátí in the neuter nouns ending in आनु (see Edaljis Guj. Grammar p. 26, note 5.) ; as उधराणु collection. I think these neuter nouns in उ, both in Naipáli and Gujarátí, ought correctly to be written with an anunásika, as we have it in the Gujarátí infinitives in वुँ, as करवुँ *to do*. There are many examples of this change of a Hindí औ, ओ, or ऊ to उ both in Naipáli and Gujarátí. There is, e. g., the Gujarátí infinitive, as करवुँ, (the exact equivalent of the Naipáli करनुँ) which corresponds to the Braj Bháshá infinitive करवैँ and the Alwári, करवूँ and Márwári करवैँ ; again *sum* in the Braj Bháshá is हैँ, high Hindí and Márwári हँ, Alwári हूँ, but in Naipáli and Gujarátí हूँ ; *quis* is in Hindí कौन, but in Naipáli कुन, etc.

In order to remove all doubts as to the correctness of the identification of the ordinary Gaurian infinitives with the Sanskrit and Prákrit participles future passive formed by the affix अनीय, I will add the following, as I think, conclusive arguments.

1. On the theory that the Gaurian infinitives are verbal nouns formed

Or. एसे कस्मवि अपरावुद्पक्खडुयालके गेहे ॥ i. e.

Skr. एतत् कस्यापि अपराटतपक्षद्वारकं गेहम् ॥

Or. काह न होइ चलाचले घणे ॥ i. e.

Skr. कस्य न भवति चलाचलं घनम् ॥

by the affix अन, the Gujarátí infinitive, which ends in वुँ (as करवुँ to do, जावुँ to go) cannot be explained. Even if we should set aside the difficulty of deriving the termination एँ, औँ, ऊँ, etc., from the Prákrit अं, and should admit that, e. g., Maráthí करणेँ, Hindí करनौँ, etc., are derivable from the Prákrit करणं, still there remains the Gujarátí करवुँ, which, it is manifest, can in no wise be connected with the Prákrit करणं. On the other hand, on the theory that the Gaurian infinitives are identical with the (Skr. or) Prákrit part. fut. pass. the Gujarátí infinitives find a very easy explanation. The Gujarátí करवुँ to do or जावुँ to go, etc., are evidently identical with the Maráthí करावेँ or जावेँ, *i. e.* the Gujarátí infinitives are identical with the Maráthí gerund in आवेँ. But the Maráthí gerunds in आवेँ are, as regards the sense, identical with the Maráthí forms in एँ (e. g. करावेँ is identical with करणेँ). It follows that the Maráthí forms in एँ and their equivalents in all the Gaurian languages must also be gerunds, *i. e.*, derived from the Sanskrit, and Prákrit part. fut. pass. (or gerund, which is only a particular use of the former), formed by the affix अनिय. On this theory everything falls easily and naturally into its place. Both Sanskrit participles fut. pass.,—those formed by the affix अनिय as well as those formed by the affix तय—passed through the Prákrit into Gaurian.* In the latter they were among other uses put to the use of expressing the idea of the infinitive or gerund. But gradually one or the other of those alternative forms gained the ascendancy, and it so happened, that in all Gaurian languages, with the exception of Gujarátí, that participle future passive which was formed by the affix अनिय, dispossessed the other formed by the affix तय. On the contrary in Gujarátí the part. fut. pass. in तय dispossessed the other in अनिय. Still the *principle* of forming the infinitive is in all Gaurian languages identical. If this be the case, one may naturally expect that all or some Gaurian languages will retain traces of an original twofold form of the infinitive, derived from the twofold form of the Sanskrit and Prákrit part. fut. pass. Such traces actually exist, as I shall show, in the principal Gaurian languages. That both forms still exist and are commonly used in Maráthí has been already mentioned; e. g., *it is necessary for us to go abroad* is in Maráthí both अन्हास देशान्तरीँ जावया चेँ and जाण्या चेँ पडेल; again *incitement to act* is either करावया ची or करण्या ची प्रेरणा (see *Manual* §. III. note.). As regards Hindí, while the modern High Hindí possesses only the forms in ना (= नौँ), the old and low Hindí dialects possess both forms. In the Braj Bháshá the infinitive may end both in नौँ and वैँ, e. g., Rájaníti p. 69, दसनक बोल्हौ भाई यामेँ कहा जानवौँ है, *i. e.*, high Hindí दसनक बोला

* I may take this opportunity of stating that, whenever this phrase of *Sansk. forms passing through Prákrit into Gaurian*, is employed, it is not meant to express a *historic fact*—for Prákrit is not a derivation of (what is commonly called) Sanskrit—but a *phonetic fact*.

भाई इस में क्या जानना है; or p. 24, तातेँ भिच्चा उपाय करि जीवैँ जोग नाहीँ कपन त सांगिवैँ औ मरिवैँ समान है (=high Hindí जीना योग्य नहीं है.....सांगना और मरना समान है). It may be remarked in confirmation of this view, that the declension of the infinitive in नैँ is apparently defective; it occurs only in the nominative (in नैँ) and locative (in नि); e. g., p. 4, बैठि रहनौ कपत कौ काम है (= H. Hindí बैठ रहना); p. 6. वह बिचाय करि कहनि लाग्यौ (H. H. कहने लगा). But in the other cases the oblique form in वैँ of the infinitive in वैँ is substituted for the oblique form in नेँ of the infinitive in नैँ; e. g., हैँ तुम ते कहु पूछवे को अया हैँ (= H. H. पूछने को); or मेरे मन की बात काहूँ सेँ कहवे की नाहीँ (= H. H. कहने की नहीं). In the Marwáří (form of the low Hindí), I believe, the infinitive in वैँ* is even the only one in use; see the vocabulary appended to the "Selection of Khyáls or Marwáří plays" (Beawr Mission Press, 1866); e. g., षुटवैँ to open (खोलना); ताकवैँ to leave (त्यागना); दिरावैँ to cause to give (दिलाना); निकसवैँ to quit (निकसना), etc., etc.; examples are:

मैँ कुँ वाण्यो रामगढ रो अंगरेज रो पायो ।
 न्हारो माल लूटवाबालो नहीं रजपूती जाया ॥ e. g.
 H. H. मैँ हँवनिया रामगढ का अंगरेज को करिन्दा ।
 हमारा माल लूठनेवाला राजपूत न होजायो ॥
 Play Dungarasinha p. 4.
 ऊकम दीया है कंपनी समैँ अदल जमावा आया ॥
 याँ कै काँई वाँटणुँस जी ये कूँ लड़वा जावो ॥
 H. H. मैँ अदल जमाने को आया हँ तुम कूँ लड़ने को जाओगे ॥
 Play, Angrez our Pathán p. 73, 75.

As regards Panjábí, I am inclined to think that what the Lúdiáná Grammar calls the indefinite participle and which is not declinable, is, in reality, that other form of the infinitive. It terminates in वैँ which is identical with the *oblique form* of the Braj Bháshá infinitive in वैँ.—As regards Bangálí, it possesses both forms of the infinitive, *viz.* in न and in इबा; as करण and करिबा to do. The latter form in इबा is to be compared with the Braj Bháshá *oblique form* in इवेँ of the infinitives in इवाँ;

* I write the Marwáří Infinitive (in वैँ) as well as the Braj Bháshá infinitive (in वैँ) with a final Anunásika. The printed books that I have seen, never have it. The reason is that by the vulgar a final nasal is often very indistinctly pronounced, sometimes even altogether dropped; e. g., the local partiele मेँ is in Ganwáří and other low Hindí dialects commonly pronounced only मे or मा. Nevertheless there is no doubt whatever, that the correct form is मेँ or माँ. For the same reason the form with the final Anunásika is the correct form of those infinitives; for only the Nom. sing. neuter of the part. fut. pass. is capable of expressing the infinitive idea, that is, the mere act of the verb, see the sūtra of Pánini quoted below; e. g., करिवैँ can only be a corruption of कर्त्तव्यं but not of कर्त्तव्य, as in Latin agendum may stand for agere but not agendus.

as Bang. करिबा = Braj करिबे or करवे. They are identical; for, as I shall show afterwards, the Bangálí infinitive in इबा is merely the *oblique form* (= Prakrit genitive sing.) of an infinitive in इबैँ; it never occurs in the nominative (*i. e. direct form*); see Shama Churn Sircar's Grammar p. 149, note 40. The Bangálí infinitive in इबा is also almost identical with the Prákrit form of the part. fut. pass. in तब्य, as given in some MSS. which have, e. g., हसिब्वं for हसिअब्वं the usual form. The form हसिब्वं is, no doubt, the form of the later Prákrit, arisen from the older form हसिअब्वं by sandhi (or phonetic decay). The real origin of the infinitive (or gerund) in न has become very much obscured in modern Bangálí; though there are a few indications of it still remaining; e. g., while the final short अ of the infinitive of the Ist and IIIrd classes of verbs is *quiescent*, that of the infinitive of the second class and the causal verbs is pronounced (as ǒ). Again while the infinitives of the former classes are declined according to the first declension, *i. e.*, like such nouns as वाघ tiger, सन्तान child (with *quiescent* अ); the infinitives of the IInd class are declined according to the IIIrd declension, *i. e.*, like such adjectives as बर great, छोट small (with audible अ), see Shama Churn Sircar's Grammar, pp. 129, 149, note 40. For example करण *to do* (Ist class) is pronounced karan, but वेड़ान *to walk* (IInd class) is pronounced beránǒ. Again, the genitive of करण is करणेर, but that of वेड़ान is वेड़ानर. I have shown already (in Essay III) that the Bangálí nouns ending in an audible अ, belong to the *Prákritic element*, that is, that their final audible अ is a contraction of the original Prákrit ending अक (इक or अअ, इअ). Accordingly, the final audible अ of the infinitive also indicates that it must be the remnant of an original Prákrit ending इअ or ईअ (that is, that अन anǒ stands for अणीअ or अणिअ). Another indication of that real origin of the infinitive or gerund in न is this, that they may optionally end in नि, instead of न; e. g., *threading* may be both गायन and गायनि (Ist class); *burning* पोड़ान and पोड़ानि (IInd class), *thatching* छाउन and छाउनि (IIIrd class), see Shama Churn Sircar's Grammar, p. 186. Now this form in नि is also found in the Braj Bháshá, where it is a substitute for the form in ने or वे (*i. e.*, the *oblique form* of the infinitives in नैँ and वैँ); e. g., he began to speak is in the Br. Bh. कहनि लाग्या for the high Hindí कहने लगा. The termination अनि is, evidently, in both languages alike, a corruption of the Prákrit termination अणीअ; and as it is found in the infinitives of all three classes of Bangálí verbs, it indicates that the infinitives of all three classes are really the Prákrit Part. Fut. Pass. in अणीअ (Skr. अनीय). Moreover these forms of the infinitive in इ (as कहनि), and the Naipálí infinitive form in उ (as मननु) clearly show, how gradually the original ending अणीअ has become worn down to a simple अ; for the final short इ and उ become according to the Gaurian law *quiescent* and thus like अ (see the explanation of this process

in Essay III) ; e. g., instead of the Braj Bháshá कहनि लाग्यै we have in Naipáli भनन लाग, in Sindhí चवन लगो. In this respect Sindhí agrees with Bangáli ; in both languages the termination of the original affix अनीय has become worn off altogether. Sindhí infinitives, e. g., are पढ़न *to read*, जागन *to wake*, करन *to do* (see W. H. Wathen's Sindhí Grammar, pp. 37, 38). But it is clear that in modern Bangáli, in consequence of the affix अनीय having become decayed to अन and the real origin of the latter being forgotten, a great confusion has arisen. For in many cases, Sanskrit verbal nouns, really formed by the affix अन (not अनीय), have been introduced into Bangáli to serve as infinitives, under the mistaken idea that the Bangáli infinitives in अन, are really such verbal nouns. A notable instance of this kind is the so-called infinitive करण *to do*. This word करण is really the Skr. verbal noun करणम्. This is shown by the presence of the lingual ण. It is not a corruption of the Skr. करणीयम् ; for in that case it would be written करन (as it is in Sindhí), as Bangáli, like Hindí, turns all lingual ण which it has received through the Prákrit, into dental न. This is proved by the causal करान (for Prákrit कारावणीय, for Skr. कारणीय), which ends in the audible अ (karánō), and therefore has retained more of its original character. I believe, therefore, that the real infinitive of the (primary) verb *to do* is करन, and not करण, which latter form is probably merely an emendation of Bangáli purists, prompted by a mistaken etymology, (as if it were a *Sanskritic* word, and identical with the Skr. करणम्). Perhaps old Bangáli MSS. (of which I have no specimen) might bear out my view. As regards Gujarátí, there also both forms of the Skr. and Prák. Part. Fut. Pass. occur. That in तव्य we have represented by the ordinary Gujarátí infinitives in वुं. The other in अनीय, I think, we can trace in the Gujarátí verbal nouns in आणु, as उधराणु *collection* (see Edalji's Grammar, p. 26, note 5).

2. Another argument for the identity of the Gaurian infinitive and the Sanskrit and Prákrit Part. Fut. Pass. in अनीय is this, that in Hindí and Panjábí the infinitives are often used as adjectives and admit of a differentiation of gender and number ; e. g., in High Hindí and Panjábí करना is masculine and neuter, and करनी is feminine : in the Braj Bháshá it is करनौ masculine, करनी feminine, and करनैँ neuter. Thus, "to make many excuses is not good," is in Hindí बड़त बाते बनानीँ (feminine plural) अच्छा नहीं ; "there will be gnashing of teeth" is in Panjábí कचीचीआँ लैणीआँ होणगीआँ (lit. to take gnashings of teeth will be) ; see Etherington's Hindí Grammar, §. 541, and Loodiana Gram. of Panjábí §. 156. Now the Sanskrit and Prákrit nouns in अन do not admit a change of gender and number in relation to another noun, because they have no adjectival force, but are merely substantives ; whereas the Part. Fut. Pass. in अनीय are adjectival and change in gender and number. It does not seem probable, nor even

possible, that the verbal nouns in अन can have changed their character so radically in Gaurian.

3. It is a very peculiar usage of all Gaurian languages to employ the infinitive to express *command* or *necessity*. E. g., “never go to their house” is in Hindí उन के यहाँ कभी न जाना (Braj Bháshá जानैँ or जावैँ), which would be in Sanskrit अमृषां स्यान्नं कदाचिद् न यानीयम्. Again “we must all die” is हम सबों को मरना है = Skr. अस्माकं सर्वेषां (हते) मरणीयमस्ति. In Panjábí तुमीँ आउना “you must come” = Skr. युष्माभिर् आगमनीयम्. In Maráthí पत्रलिहीत जाणेँ “continue to write to us.” (See Etherington H. Gr. §. 544, 545. Loodiana P. Gr. §. 95. Manual of Mar. Gr. §. 110, note). The only rational explanation of this usage is afforded by the theory of the identity of the Gaurian infinitive with the Sanskrit and Prákrit Part. Fut. Pass. It may be also noted that in modern Sanskrit, the proper imperative is almost as a rule substituted by the Part. Fut. Pass. (in अनिय or तव्य).

4. All the uses to which the Sanskrit Part. Fut. Pass. in अनिय is put according to this theory in Gaurian, (e. g., to express the mere act, as infinitive), is provided for by Pánini. He has a sūtra ह्यत्युटो बहुलम् (III, 3, 113), which is explained in the Laghu Kaumudí to mean, that the Kṛitya affixes, to which अनिय and तव्य belong, are occasionally employed in many ways different from that enjoined by the ordinary rules (see Siddhánta Kaum. p. 300, 2nd Vol. and Laghu Kaum. No. 823, p. 284). The examples given are स्नानीयं चूर्णं powder for bathing (to both) = Hindí नहाने का चूर्ण; and दानीयो विप्रः a brahman who is to be presented (with something); with which compare in Panjábí मैँ उये विहिणा ऊण हँ = Hindí मैँ वहाँ बैठने का हँ; or ऊण हेरनाँ गलाँ दी बाबत् लिखणा हँ = Hindí मैँ (or हैँ) दूसरी बातों की विषय लिखने का हँ (see Loodiana Grammar, §. 95). These irregular, *bahulam* uses, of the Part. Fut. Pass. were, no doubt, more peculiar to the *vulgar* Sanskrit; and, hence, it is intelligible, how they became the regular uses in the Gaurian. Note also the commentary to the sūtra तव्यत्तयानीयरः (Panini III, 196), where the example is given एधितव्यं एधनीयं त्वया and this is explained भावे औत्सर्गिकम् एकवचनं क्लीबत्वं च (Siddh. Kaum. p. 298, 2nd Vol.), *i. e.*, when the Part. Fut. Pass. expresses the *action itself* (= एधनस), the *singular and neuter* is *naturally* employed. Accordingly the Part. Fut. Pass. (in अनिय and तव्य) in the sing. neuter may express the mere act of the verb. Both characteristics are found in the Gaurian (so called) infinitives. They, quâ *infinitives*, both express the mere act of the verb, and also stand in the sing. neuter; as Hindí — नैँ or (ना), Maráthí — नेँ, Gujarátí वुँ, etc.

5. Perhaps the most serious objection which is felt at first sight against the identity of the Gaurian infinitive with the Sanskrit and Prákrit Part. Fut. Pass. is this, that it involves a change from the Pass. and Future to the Active and Present. But we have an exactly analogous phenomenon

in Latin. The Latin Part. Fut. Pass. in *andus* or *endus* may also have a passive or an active sense. When it is used passively, it may either imply futurity, in which case it is the proper Part. Fut. Pass., expressing chiefly necessity or fitness; or it may imply present time, in which case it is a verbal adjective (commonly called *gerundive*), expressing an enduring contemporaneous action. When it is used actively, it serves to express the oblique case of the Infinitive Present Active, and is called the *Gerund*. Now exactly in these three ways the Sanskrit and Prákrit Part. Fut. Pass. is used in Gaurian; e. g., in gerundial construction, *there is time to write a letter*, is in Latin *epistolam scribendi tempus est*, in Gaurian चिट्ठी को लिखने का काल है; or in gerundival construction, Latin, *tempus est epistolae scribendae*, Gaurian चिट्ठी लिखनी का काल है; or in Part. Fut. Pass. construction, *you must write a letter*, Latin, *a vobis epistola scribenda est*, तुम से चिट्ठी लिखनी है (or लिखनी चाहिये). The Gaurian goes a step beyond the classic Latin in using the Part. Fut. Pass. also to express the nominative case of the infinitive; but the same usage is not unknown to the Latin of the middle ages, where the Nom. Sing. Neut. is sometimes used to express the mere act of the verb as *scribendum* to write = Hindí लिखनैँ (H. H. लिखना).* The Latin has another parallel case in the verbal adjectives in *tivus*, which have generally active sense, but as regards origin are identical with the Sanskrit Part. Fut. Pass. in तथ्य (e. g., *activus*, *dativus* = दातथ्यः, etc.), see Bopp's Comp. Gram. §. 902, p. 352, IIIrd Vol. Also the Páli has an analogous usage. It employs sometimes the Sansk. Part. Fut. Pass., formed by means of the affix य, to express the mere action of the verb, e. g., देय्य *giving* = Skr. देय (of root दा), पेय्य *drinking* = Skr. पेय (of root पा), हेय्य *rejecting* (of हा); मेय्य *loving* (of मा), ज्ञेय्य *knowing* (of ज्ञा); see Mason's Páli Grammar, §. 263a, p. 146, also §. 235b, p. 134.

But we must return to our original enquiry. We have now seen that the Gaurian neuter terminations ऐँ, औँ, औँ, ऊँ, etc., cannot be derived from the Sanskrit neuter termination अम् or the Prák. neuter termination अं or अ. We have further, by an examination of the Gaurian infinitive and gerund, seen, that their neuter terminations औँ, ऐँ, ऊँ, etc., are derived or contracted from the Sanskrit termination ईयम् and the Prákrit termination ईअं (or इअं or अअं). This not only confirms the law of derivation stated previously (pp. 65, 66.), but also discovers the *modus* of the derivation of the Gaurian neuter terminations ऐँ, औँ, ऊँ, etc., viz., that they represent a Sanskrit or Prákrit terminal *dissyllable* (in the present case ईयं or ईअं).

* If Bopp's opinion (Comp. Gram. §. 809, p. 183, IIIrd Vol.) be correct, as it doubtless is, that the Latin Part. Fut. Pass. in *andus* is originally identical with the Prák. Part. Pres. Act. in अन्तः or अन्दः (Skr. in अन्त), the process of change in meaning is in Latin exactly the reverse from that in Gaurian. But this does not affect the argument in the text, as the principle of change is identical in both cases.

I will now proceed to illustrate this theory by the examination of a few other neuter forms in Gaurian which will lead us to the same result. In Maráṭhī there are three irregular past participles of an identical formation, quite peculiar to these three only. They are गेलेँ (of root गम् *to go*), केलेँ (of root क् or कर *to do*), and मेलेँ (of root मृ or मर *to die*). I have given them in the form of the Nom. Sing. Neuter. Their corresponding masculine would be गेलो or गेला, केलो or केला, मेलो or मेला.* These three past participles are also irregular in Mágadhī Prákrit; and their irregularity is also quite peculiar to themselves. The corresponding (Mágadhī) Prákrit forms are, namely, गडे, कडे, मडे, (see Pr. Prak. XI, 15). These forms are in the nominative singular masculine; the final ए being the Mágadhī substitute for the common Prákrit termination ओ (Pr. Prak. XI, 10.). Their corresponding neuter would be गडं, कडं, मडं. These represent the Sanskrit forms गतं, कृतं, मृतं. Here the Sanskrit dental त् of the past participle affix त् has become in (Mágadhī) Prákrit lingual ड्; and this in Maráṭhī-Gaurian has changed to ल्. This change of Skr. त् and Prákrit ड् to ल्, however, is in Maráṭhī not confined to the three past participles गेलेँ, केलेँ, मेलेँ, but has become universal, as *got loose* is सुटलेँ, etc.; and therefore it is not the irregularity peculiar to these three participles. The peculiar irregularity of those three participles is in Prákrit, indeed, their change of the Skr. त् to ड्; but in Maráṭhī the peculiar irregularity is not the change of ड् to ल्, but of the first अ to ए; compare Mágadhī Prákrit गडं, कडं, मडं, with Maráṭhī-Gaurian गेलेँ, केलेँ, मेलेँ. But this peculiar Maráṭhī change of अ to ए is also explained by the Prákrit; for, fortunately, in regard to one of the three (*viz.*, केलेँ) the change shows itself already in Prákrit. Here, namely, we meet with the past participle form कलिकं or केलिकं for Sanskrit कृतम्. For केलिकं we find also केरिकं or केरकं. They are derived from the original past participial form कडं or कलं or करं. To this the peculiar Prákrit affix क is added (hence करक or कलक); then the first अ is changed to ए by the rule of Pr. Prak. I, 5. (hence केरक or केलक); then the termination अक is weakened to इक (hence केरिक and केलिक). We have now traced the origin of the Maráṭhī form केलेँ in its various steps. They are; 1., Skr. कृतं, 2., Mág. Prák. कडं or कलं, 3., Prák. कलकं; 4., Pr. केरकं; 5., Pr. केलिकं or केलिअं, 6., Mar. Gaur. (old) केलियं, 7., Mar. केलेँ. That is, the terminal एँ of the Maráṭhī form केलेँ is not derived from the terminal अं of the Prákrit form कडं, but from the *terminal dissyllable* इअं or इयं of the Prákrit form केलिअं or केलियं. In other words, we have arrived at exactly the same result as that of the previous examination of the infinitives. But to this another result must now be added; *viz.*, that the

* The masc. forms in ओ here and wherever else mentioned in these essays, are old Maráṭhī.

terminal dissyllable इयं, to which nothing corresponding exists in Sanskrit, is owing to the addition of the Prákrit affix क.

Now by an exactly analogous process we may derive from the Mágadhí Prákrit forms गडं and मडं, first the intermediate Prákrit forms गेलिकं and मेलिकं; and next, the Maráṭhí forms गेलेँ and मेलेँ. The identity of the process of their origin is guaranteed by the identity of their peculiar irregularities.

But further, the neuter termination लेँ is not only found in those three past participles (गेलेँ, केलेँ, मेलेँ), but in *all* Maráṭhí past participles. It follows therefore, that their formation must be analogous to that of the other three participles; that is, that their termination लेँ cannot be derived from the Sanskrit or Prákrit termination तं, but from a Prákrit termination तर्कं or तिकं; in other words, from the base of the ordinary Prákrit past participles, increased by the peculiar Prákrit affix क;* e. g., Mar. मारिलेँ *killed* is not derived from Prákrit मारितं or मारिञ्चं, but from the amplified Prákrit form मारितिकं = मारिडिञ्चं = मारिलियं = मारिलेँ or मरितकं = मारिडञ्चं = मारिलयं = मारिलेँ.

But that is not all. The result of the present enquiry must plainly be put into the form of a much more general law; *viz.*, whenever a Prákrit (or Sanskrit) neuter noun, be it a participle or a substantive or an adjective, has a terminable monosyllable अ, but shows the termination ऐँ in its stead in Maráṭhí; this Maráṭhí termination ऐँ cannot be derived from the Prákrit terminal monosyllable अ, but must be derived from a Prákrit terminal dissyllable अञ्चं or इञ्चं (for अकं or इकं), obtained by adding the Prákrit affix क to the Prákrit base in अ. No other Prákrit affix can here come in consideration (for effecting that increase of the base); 1., because no other affix beside क is added *without affecting the meaning*; and 2., because, though in a few cases one or two other affixes are added without any meaning, (e. g., Skr. विद्युत् lightning is in Prák. विज्जू or विज्जुली; Skr. पीत yellow is in Prák. पीञ्चं or पीञ्चलं, see Pr. Prák. IV, 26), such addition of these affixes is confined to these isolated cases, while the addition of क is *most common* and may be made to *any* noun (Pr. Prák. IV, 25); and 3., moreover in order to account for the Gaurian terminal forms ऐँ, औँ, etc., the elision of the consonant of the affix is necessary; now क can be elided, but ल is not elided.

The results which have been set forth so far, might have been equally well arrived at by taking the case of a Hindí past participle. E. g., *it is*

* It is noteworthy that in the Gáthá dialect (or vulgar Sanskrit) "nouns and participles are frequently lengthened by the addition of the syllable क, as रोदन्तको, गच्छमानको, भाषमाणकाः, ददन्तिकाः, रोदितव्यकाः, आगतिकाः, दासिनिकाः." (Muir, *Sanskrit Texts*, vol. II, p. 122). Mark, how often the terminal syllable अक changes to इक.

said is in the Braj Bháshá कछौँ. This is the nom. sing. neuter; the masc. would be कछौ, the fem. कछी. The corresponding form to कछौँ is in Sanskrit कथितं and in Prákrit कहिदं or कहिअं. Now the form कहिअं could not yield the Hindí form कछौँ, because the vowel इ of the Prákrit form is present in the semivowel य of the Hindí form and the remaining terminal अं cannot give औँ, according to general glottic law. But if we add the favourite Prákrit affix क to कथितं, everything is natural and easy. For कथितकं would be in Prákrit कहिअअं, and this in Hindí-Gaurian कहिऔँ or कछौँ (just as हअं ego becomes हौँ).

According to this theory, then, the original of the Gaurian neuter terminations एँ, ईँ, औँ, आँ, ऊँ, ऊँ, is the Prákrit terminal dissyllable इअं or अअं, which, according to Gaurian law,* becomes in old Gaurian इयं or अयं or अवं. If this be really the case, it might not unreasonably be expected, that traces of those original terminal forms इयं, अयं, अवं may be found in Gaurian. Such examples I am, indeed, able to produce; and they will be a further confirmation of the truth of my theory. Only this is to be observed. The Gaurian terminal forms इयं, अयं, अवं, are very slightly, if at all really, different from the Prákrit terminal form ईअं (for Skr. ईयं), इअं (for Skr. इकं) and अअं (for Skr. अकं). If, therefore, the Gaurian forms at all existed, they can only have existed in the earliest period of the Gaurian, when it was yet only a modified and decayed form of Prákrit. In Hindí we have no literature dating so far back. The earliest Hindí work known at present is the epic of Chand, which is already subsequent to that period; how much subsequent, it is not easy to say; but it is in Chand, that we find traces of those original Gaurian neuter terminations; only, for the reason now explained, they must not be expected to be very common.† Such examples are the following:

* This Gaurian law has been repeatedly referred to in these essays, though I have never distinctly stated it. It is this; Gaurian cannot tolerate the hiatus of vowels created by the Prákrit, through ejecting the medial single mute consonants of the Sanskrit; and in order to prevent such hiatus, Gaurian either makes Sandhi of the vowels or separates them by inserting the (euphonious) semivowels य, or व्. It should be noted, in order to prevent misunderstanding, that Gaurian sometimes creates hiatus of its own; these, of course, it retains. The law has only reference to hiatus, created by Prákrit, e. g., Skr. उपविष्टः becomes in Prák. उअइष्टो; in Gaur. बैटा (Hindí); Skr. चर्मकारः, in Prák. चम्मआरो, in Gaur. चमार; Skr. करणधारकः, in Prák. करणहारओ or करणआरओ, in Gaur. (Mar.) करणारो or (Hindí) करणहारा; Skr. लोचनं, Pr. लोअणं, Gaur. लोयनं; Skr. गतः, Pr. गओ, Gaur. गया; Skr. कृतः, Pr. किओ, Gaur. किया, etc.

† On account of Maráthí being so much more conservative of its *Prákritic* character, I should expect old Maráthí to afford many more examples of those Gaurian neuter terminations; but unfortunately I have had no opportunity of examining any old Maráthí work.

बाले रसन अली तामयं ।

चङ्गं वा वृद्धि अग्रानयं ॥ I, 26.

Or हननं निनयककं सेन । कहितं न च पूर्वयं ॥

असुद्धं च छतं एषां । विना खांमौ रिन जुधं ॥ IV, 220. 230.

or कुट्टै सिरं करारयं ।

कपास ज्यै पिंजारयं ॥

परीय संग सामयं ।

च लुक्क रषि नामयं ॥ IV, 204. 207.

फटिय वत प्रहासं । अनिलं सिजेम परिमलयं ॥ IV, 278.

An instance of the neuter in इयं occurs, e. g., in the following verse :

कर मोहि पल्लव भांनियं ।

चङ्गं वांन तो घरे हांनियं ॥ I, 26.

In the last verse भांनियं and हांनियं are probably contractions of भननियं and हननियं for Skr. भञ्जनीयं and हननीयं in the sense of the infinitive. In the former verses अज्ञानयं stands for अज्ञानं; पूर्वयं for पूर्व, करारयं for करारं पिंजारयं for पिंजारं; सामयं for श्यामं; नामयं for नाम. And the only, and natural, way of explaining the origin of these amplified forms is by the theory that the shorter forms were increased by the addition of the Prākṛit affix क; thus we should have (with the usual elision of क्) the Prākṛit forms अज्ञानयं, पुव्वयं, करारयं, पिंजारयं, सामयं, नामयं and finally these forms would change in Gaurian by the usual insertion of the euphonic य् into अज्ञानयं, पूर्वयं, etc.*

Such neuters as अज्ञानयं, पूर्वयं, etc., prove clearly that general principle which has been stated already, that the Prākṛit affix क was not only added to participles past passive, but also to substantives and adjectives; though this is a fact, which perhaps hardly needed to be particularly stated. But these neuters account very well for the Marāṭhī neuter adjectives and substantives in एँ as उच्चैँ *high*, तल्लैँ *tank*, etc. For the termination अयं as previously shown naturally contracts into एँ.† Hence, e. g., उच्चैँ presupposes an older form उच्चयं, which stands for उच्चं just as अज्ञानयं for अज्ञानं.

We have now seen that the Prākṛit neuter nouns (Part., Adj., Subst.) may pass into the Gaurian either in the *general* form of their base ending

* I may add here, once more, in explanation, that it is not to be supposed that every Gaurian neuter actually passed through these different steps of phonetic modification. The process of neuter formation, detailed here, only took place really when Gaurian first separated from Prākṛit. After it had become the rule in Gaurian, that neuters must end in अयं or एँ or औँ, many neuters, of course, were formed which never passed through any of the steps of the process; e. g. the neuter पूर्वयं is formed direct from the Sanskrit पूर्व. If it had passed *really* (as *ideally* it must be supposed to have passed) through that process, it would have been either पूर्वयं; or पुव्वयं; for the Prākṛit of पूर्व is पुव्वं.

† In Col. Vans Kennedy's Marāṭhī Dictionary the form भेँ is given for भयं fear.

in अं, in which case these neuters terminate in Gaurian in अ; or in the *particular* forms of their base ending in अं (amplified by the addition of the affix क). This termination अं becomes in old Gaurian अयं. Instances of old Gaurian neuters in अयं have been adduced. In modern Gaurian the termination अयं is contracted to एँ; and this neuter terminal form we have in Maráthí.

But the old Gaurian termination अयं is not the only form which the Prákrit termination अं (= अकं) assumes in Gaurian. The Prákrit termination अकं (or अं) suffers in Prákrit already a twofold deteriorating process. It changes sometimes into इकं (or इं), sometimes into उकं (or उं). This deterioration is found in Prákrit only in a few and isolated cases; but in Gaurian it has assumed much greater dimensions, and has affected, as we shall presently see, whole classes of nouns. It is therefore doubtlessly more appropriate to consider these phonetic modifications of the original Prákrit termination अं as a Gaurian one, than as a Prákrit one. This should be noted, as it has some bearing on the question of the presence or absence of an *oblique form* of the Gaurian nouns which have this modified terminal form. For proofs of the deterioration of the Prákrit base-termination अक into इक and उक, I must refer more especially to the examination of the Gaurian masculine and feminine nouns in ई and ऊ. In the Mṛichchhakati the form केरक (the Prák. modification of the Sanskrit कृत) often alternates with करिक. Again, the Sanskrit वृश्चिक *scorpion*, itself already modified from an original form वृश्चक, becomes in Prákrit विंक्षुक or विंक्षुअ or विच्छुअ (cf. Pr. Prák. I, 15).* Again, the Sanskrit माटक becomes in Prákrit माउअ (for मातुक cf. Prák. Prák. I, 29); that is माटक first changes to मातक, (by Pr. Prák. I, 27; next to मातुक). If the Prákrit base termination in अक may change to इक or उक in the case of masc. and fem., it is plain that it may do so also in the case of neuters. In Gaurian the Prákrit neuter terminations इं (= इकं) and उं (= उकं) are slightly modified; viz., in old Gaurian to इयं and उयं, and in modern Gaurian to ईँ and ऊँ, e. g., *pearl* is in Skr. मुक्ता in Prák. मोत्ता or मोत्तिका. The latter has a bye-form मोत्तिकं or मोत्तिअं (Skr. मौत्तिकं), and this changes in old Gaurian to मोत्तियं, in modern Gaurian (Maráthí) to मोत्तीँ. That this is the true derivation of the final of मोत्तीँ is proved by such neuter nouns as पाणीँ *water*, मीरीँ *pepper*, लोणीँ *butter*, दहीँ *curds*. For पाणी represents an old form पाणियं, a Prákrit form पाणियं, and Skr. पाणियम्; मीरीँ represents an old Gaurian मिरियं, a Prákrit मिरियं, and Skr. मिरियम्; लोणीँ an old Gaurian लोणियं, Prák. लोणियं or लोणियं, and a Sanskrit नवनीतम्; दहीँ an old

* But the unmodified form विंक्षिअ or विच्छिअ must have existed also in Prákrit. This is proved by the Naipálí which has विच्छी for scorpion, (see St. Luke xi. 12, x. 19.), while the Hindí has बिच्छू and the Maráthí विच.

Gaurian दहियं, a Prák. दधियं or दधिकं, and Sanskrit दधि. Again *touch* is in Sanskrit स्पर्श, in Prákrit फंस or फंसक; the latter has a bye-form फंसुक or फंसुचं, (with the meaning *branch* of a river) which changes in old Gaurian to फंसुवं and in modern Gaurian (Maráthí) to फँसूँ. This derivation is proved by such neuter nouns as अँसूँ *tear* which stands for a Prákrit अंसुचं or अंसुकं and a Sanskrit अश्रु; and जूँ *yoke* which stands for Prákrit जुचं and Sanskrit जुगम्.*

We have now discovered the derivation of all the Gaurian neuter terminal forms; *viz.*

Mar.	एँ	is derived from old Gaur.	अचं	and Prák.	अचं (= अकं)
"	ईँ	" " " "	इचं	" "	इचं (= इकं) or ईचं (= ईकं)
"	ऊँ	either " " "	उचं	" "	उचं (= उकं)
		or " " "	अवं or ओं	" "	अचं (= अकं)
Hindí	औँ ओँ ऊँ	} is derived	" "	अवं or ओं	" अचं (= अकं)
Gujar. Naipáli	उँ		" " " "	अवं or ओं ;	" अचं (= अकं)

The neuter terminal forms, of which the derivations are here given, are the terminations of the *direct forms* of the Gaurian neuter nouns. We will now proceed to examine the *oblique forms* of the same nouns. And it will be seen that this examination will confirm the result already attained.

We will first take the Maráthí neuter nouns in ऊँ. These are divided into *three* classes; (1) those which have no *oblique form* at all, as राजालूँ a kind of vegetable; (2) those which have an *oblique form* in आ, (*i. e.*, substitute आ for ऊँ), as तडूँ *pony*, *oblique form* तडा; (3) those which have an *oblique form* in वा, (*i. e.*, substitute वा for ऊँ), as तारूँ *ship*, *oblique form* तारवा (or तारवा). Now if we turn back to the list of derivations of the *direct forms* given above, we find a twofold derivation of the *direct form* in ऊँ, and it will be easily seen, that there is a close agreement between the twofold derivation of the *direct form*, and the three-fold formation of the

* Some other neuters of this kind are the following; तारूँ *ship* for Prákrit तारचं bye-form of तारचं and Sanskrit तारकम् a *raft, float*; गलूँ *bile* for Prákrit गण्डचं, bye-form of गण्डचं (= गण्डकं), amplified from Sanskrit गण्डः; पेलूँ *bile* for Prák. पेडुचं, bye-form of पेडुचं, and Sanskrit पिटकम्. Again कुसूँ *circumvallation* for Prák. कुसूचं and Skr. कुशूलम्; कुँकुँ *powder* for Prák. कंकुचं and Sanskrit कंकुमम्; थरूँ *handle* for Prák. थरचं (= थरकं), amplified from Sanskrit त्तर. The change of the Skr. comp. cons. त्तर into थ is noticeable and exceptional; the regular change is into छ (see Pr. Pr. III, 40.), थ being the regular representative of स्त (see Pr. Pr. III, 12). Note also that the Hindí equivalent of the Mar. जूँ *yoke* is जुआ or जू, the former of which would represent a Prák. form जुच्यचं for (जुगकं). The form अंपुच्य occurs in the old Hindí of Chand; e. g. in the verse.

उगमे तहां अंसुच्य द्व नयनं ॥ Devagiri Kathâ v. 22.

oblique form. Namely (1), neuter nouns in ऊँ which have an *oblique form* in आ, are derived from a Prákrit base in अच्य (= अक); and (2) neuter nouns in ऊँ which have an *oblique form* in वा, are derived from a Prákrit base in उच्य (= उक); and (3) neuter nouns in ऊँ which have no *oblique form* at all, are derived or rather modified from Prákrit neuter nouns in उच्य (= उकं). Examples will explain this further. A neuter of the first class is पिछूँ *cub*; in Sanskrit the word is पित्तः masculine, but the neuter (in diminutive or endearing sense) would be पित्तं. The latter, in Prákrit, is पित्तं or पित्तकं or पित्तच्यं. Again, the last of these पित्तच्यं, changes in Gaurian to पित्तोँ and this to पिछूँ. The latter is the present Maráthí *direct form* of the word. Now the genitive of the Prákrit पित्तच्यं is पित्तच्यस्स or पित्तच्यस or पित्तच्यह. The last of these becomes in Gaurian पित्तचा or (contracted by Gaurian law) पिछा, which is the present Maráthí *oblique form* of the word. Again, पेलूँ *boil* is a neuter of the second class. The Sanskrit is पिटः masc. or पिटकं neuter. In Prákrit the latter becomes पेडच्यं, which must have had a (probably vulgar) bye-form पेडुच्यं; and this form पेडुच्यं changes in Gaurian to पेलुवं (or perhaps पेलुच्यं), and this to पेलोँ,* and this to पेलूँ, which last is the present Maráthí form of the word. Now the genitive of the Prákrit पेडुच्यं is पेडुच्यस्स or पेडुच्यस or पेडुच्यह. The last of these forms becomes in Gaurian पेलुचा or (contracted by Gaurian law) पेलवा, which is the present Maráthí *oblique form* of the word. Dadoba in his Maráthí Grammar admits only this form; but the *Manual* apparently admits also a form पेलवा. If this be correct, the *oblique form* in अवा, doubtlessly, is merely a euphonic modification of the original *oblique form* in वा, in order to obviate the difficulty of pronouncing a double consonant.† Again चाँचूँ is a neuter of the *third* class. I know no Sanskrit or Prákrit etymology for this or most of the neuters of this class, though, no doubt, some of them may have such an etymology. But they all have been evidently so much phonetically modified by the Gaurian, that their origin is almost unrecognizable. And having thus a purely Gaurian form, it is no wonder, that they are subject to Gaurian law, and admit no *oblique form* at all; that is, they belong to the *proper Gaurian* element. I ought to mention, however, that Dadobá (in his Grammar, §. 198., p. 72) does not admit these neuters at all; neither is any of them found in Col. Vans Kennedy's Maráthí dictionary; and, lastly, Maráthí Paṇḍits of Benares, of whom I have enquired, do not know them.‡ Even according to the *Manual* which enumerates them on p. 29., §. 67, 7., they are only a very few (about 18 altogether); and even of these some are optionally *Prákritic* and admit the *oblique form* in वा or आ. They are the following अवालूँ, उठणूँ, उवालूँ, खटूँ, चाँचूँ,

* In Bangálí उच्य or उव commonly change to ओ, see Forbes' Gr pp. 160-4.

† The separation of a compound consonant by means of an inserted euphonic अ or इ is rather common in Gaurian.

‡ I have seen, however, since that Molesworth gives them all in his dictionary.

झाँझूँ, जावुँ, टाँटूँ, पचेरूँ, फाँफूँ, हाँहूँ, हूँचूँ, * * अग्रहूँ, * * राजालूँ, * अंसूँ, * अलूँ, * कुँकुँ, * कुसूँ. Those marked with two asterisks have optionally an *obl. form* in आ, and those marked with one asterisk an *obl. form* in वा. This latter fact is explained by the circumstance, that, as has been already noticed, the deterioration of the termination अकं (or अञ्चं) to उकं (or अञ्चं) took place, as it were, on the confines of the Prákrit and Gaurian, and that, therefore, the neuter nouns which exhibit this deterioration, are sometimes treated as *Prákritic*, sometimes as *Proper Gaurian*. As regards the two other classes; that which has the *oblique form* in आ (*i. e.*, 1st class), contains all the neuter nouns in ऊँ,* the only exceptions being those already mentioned as *proper Gaurian*, and the following nine nouns गलूँ *boil*, जूँ *yoke*, तारूँ *ship*, यरूँ *haft*, हूँ *scar*, वरूँ *iron ring*, बोलूँ *sauce*, फाँरूँ *branch of a river*, पेलूँ *boil*, which form together with those marked with *two asterisks* in the list of *proper Gaurian* neuters (hence altogether 13) the 2nd class, *i. e.*, that which has an *oblique form* in वा. The paucity of the nouns of this class cannot surprise, if we consider, that the deterioration of the termination अकं into उकं can only have taken place quite exceptionally.

Next, we come to the Gujarátí and Naípálí neuter nouns in उँ, and the Marwáří neuter nouns in ओँ. They all have an *oblique form* in आ, and are evidently, as regards the formation both of the *direct* and *oblique form*, identical with the first class of the Maráthí neuter nouns in ऊँ. E. g., *gold* in Naípálí is सोनुँ; in Sanskrit it is सुवर्ण, in Prákrit सुवर्णं or सुवर्णकं or सुवर्णञ्चं. The last form सुवर्णञ्चं becomes in Gaurian सोनोँ, and this changes to सोनुँ, and this to सोनुँ, which last is the present Gujarátí *direct form* of the word. Now the genitive of the Prákrit सुवर्णञ्चं is सुवर्णञ्चस्स or सुवर्णञ्चस्स or सुवर्णञ्चस्स. The last of these forms changes in Gaurian to सोनञ्चा and this to सोना, which last form, with the addition, apparently, of a final nasal सोनाँ (the meaning of which will be explained afterwards), is the present Gujarátí *oblique form* of the word. As another representative example, we may take the Gujarátí infinitive करवुँ *to do*, to which the Marwáří infinitive करवोँ corresponds. The derivation of these infinitives has already been explained. They are formed from the Sanskrit participle future passive in तव्य. The Sanskrit is कर्त्तव्यं, in early Prákrit this is (करितव्यं or) करिञ्चव्यं, in later Prákrit करिञ्चं or करञ्चं or amplified करञ्चञ्चं,† the last of these करञ्चञ्चं changes in Gaurian to करवोँ, which is the present Marwáří *direct form* of the word,

* To this class of neuter nouns belong all Maráthí diminutives, which are neuter nouns in रूँ or डूँ.

† This amplified form करञ्चञ्चं admits a two-fold explanation. Either it may be formed from the form करञ्चं by the usual addition of the affix क (being originally करञ्चकं); or, which is perhaps more probable, the affix तव्यं may have become in

and next to करवूँ or करवुँ, which last is the present Gujarátí *direct form* of the word. Now the genitive of the Prákrit करव्वञ्चं is करव्वञ्चस्स or करव्वञ्चास्स or करव्वञ्चाह. The last of these changes in Gaurian to करवञ्चा and finally (contracted by Gaurian law) to करवा which is the present Gujarátí and Marwáří *oblique form* of the word. The Naipáli neuter nouns in उ are the infinitives. While, e. g., the Gujarátí has करवुँ *to do*, and the Marwáří करवेँ, the Naipáli has करनुँ.* The derivation of these infinitives has also been already explained. They are derived from the Sanskrit participle future passive in अनीय. The Sanskrit therefore is करणीयं; in Prákrit it is करणीञ्चं or करणिञ्चं and (broadened) करणञ्चं. This last form करणञ्चं changes in Gaurian to करनेँ (or करनैँ) which is the present *direct form* of the word in the Braj Bháshá, next to करनु which is the present Alwarí *direct form* of the word, and, finally, to करनुँ, which is the present Naipáli *direct form* of the word. Now the genitive of the Prákrit form करणञ्चं is करणञ्चस्स or करणञ्चास्स or करणञ्चाह. The last of these becomes in Gaurian करनञ्चा or, contracted by Gaurian law, करना, which is the present Naipáli *oblique form* of the word.†

The final nasal which appears in the *oblique form* of Gujarátí neuter nouns in उँ is puzzling.‡ At first sight, one might take it as an inorganic Prákrit, not only अव्वं, but also अवयं and (with elision of य), अवञ्चं, or अविञ्चं (अवियं) and (broadened) अवञ्चं (comp. vedic चलय *having gone*, Prák. चलिञ्च). In the latter case the process of development of करवुँ is this; Skr. कर्त्तव्यं, Prák. करिअविञ्चं or करिअवयं = करिअवञ्चं = करअवञ्चं; Gaur करवेँ = करवूँ = करवुँ. In this case the single व of the Gaurian form is explained by the Prákrit itself. In the other case it must be explained by the Gaurian law according to which a Prákrit similar double consonant is reduced to the single consonant. The Maráthí form करवेँ is contracted either from the Prákrit form करव्वञ्चं (which becomes in old Gaurian करावञ्चं) or from the Prák. form करअवयं. (Compare the note at the end of the essay).

* In St. Luke's gospel the Naipáli infinitive is spelled without the final nasal; thus करनु. This may be mere inaccuracy; or, if it is correct, we must assume that the original final nasal is dropped, as so often in *modern* Gaurian. This view is confirmed by the fact that traces of that Gaurian tendency of dropping the final neuter nasal, appear also in Gujarátí, where, according to Edalji's Grammar, the neuter may end in उ as well as in उँ e. g., gold is both सेनु and सेनुँ.

† This Prák. form करणञ्चं becomes in Gaurian contracted into करणेँ which is the present Maráthí *direct form* of the word.

‡ This final nasal, I think, should be written as an anunásika. In Hindí, at all events, all final and medial *Gaurian* nasals are anunásikas, but all medial (there are no final nasals of this kind) *Sanskritic* or *Prákritic* nasals are anuswáras. I am inclined to think that this rule obtains not only in Hindí, but in all Gaurian languages; it certainly does, as far as my limited acquaintance with the pronunciation of the other Gaurian languages enables me to judge. In Hindí, *kareṅge* they will do "is करेँगे not करेँगे; *evening* is साँभ (Skr. सन्ध्या, Prák. संडभा); *true* is साँच (Skr. सत्य, Pr. सच्च);

addition for a mere euphonic purpose, or to distinguish the neuter *oblique form* from the (otherwise identical and indistinguishable) masculine *oblique form*, or to assimilate the neuter *oblique form* to the neuter *direct form*. The addition of an inorganic final nasal occurs here and there in Gaurian, as e. g. in the negative particle नाहोँ or नहाँ, and in the noun मुँह (Skr. मुखम्; Prák. मुहं). The Gujarátí Grammar of the Rev. Joseph Van S. Taylor does not admit a neuter *oblique form* with a final nasal at all (see §. 140. 44., pp. 26-29). Even in Mr. Sh. Edalji's Grammar the forms with the final nasal seem to be allowed only as optional (see §. 94., p. 40). Under these circumstances the conclusion appears to be justified that the final nasal is inorganic, and, in fact, an incorrect addition made perhaps for some reason like those suggested above. If, however, the final nasal should be organic, the only solution—by no means satisfactory to my own mind—that I can suggest for the present is this; the Sanskrit neuter nouns in इ and उ insert a nasal (न or ण) before the affix of the genitive; e. g., वारि *water* has Gen. वारिणः; दधि *curds* has Gen. दधिनः; गुरु *heavy* has Gen. गुरुणः; मधु *sweet* has Gen. मधुनः. In Prákrit this use, as an optional one, is extended even to the masculines in इ and उ; e. g., अग्गी *fire* has Gen. अग्गिणो (or अग्गिस्स), वाउ *wind* has Gen. वाउणो or वाउस्स. This renders it not improbable that perhaps in later or vulgar Prákrit that use was even more extended, viz., also to neuter nouns in अ, so that, e. g., सुवसं *gold* would have not only *saint* is गोसाईँ (Skr. Pr. and गोस्वामी); *where* is कहाँ (Skr. किंस्थान, Pr. कथाने); *in* is मेँ or साहो (Skr. मध्ये Pr. सज्जन्मि), etc., etc. In all these and like words, the nasal is pronounced by Natives as an anusásika, not as an anuswára. They are all *proper Gaurian* words. But in *Prákritic* words, as चंगा *healthy*, लंबा *long*, घंटा *clock*, etc., and in *Sanskritic* words, as सन्ध्या *evening*, संयुक्त *joined*, etc., etc., the nasal is pronounced by Natives as an anuswára. The difference may, perhaps, be best illustrated by the French and English; *langage, exemple, environs* are pronounced with what Pandits would call the anunásika, but *language, example, environs*, are pronounced with what they would call the anuswára. There is an essential difference between the two nasals. The anunásika is a mere nasalization, which may be given to any sound (commonly to a vowel, but also to consonants), and therefore a mere modification of a sound (वर्णधर्म) but not a distinct sound (वर्ण) itself; while the anuswára is a distinct and separate nasal sound (वर्ण). See Max Müller's Lectures on the Science of Languages, 2nd vol., p. 164. Panini 1, 1. 8. 8, 3. 23. 24. In poetry the distinction of the two nasals is clear and important; the anuswára makes the preceding vowel *always* long, while the anunásika has no influence on it whatever. In modern printed books, unfortunately, the distinction between the anunásika and anuswára is very rarely and incorrectly observed. Those printed by natives are in this respect generally more exact, than those edited by foreigners. In future, in these essays all modern Gaurian nasals will be represented by the anunásika. In quotations, however, from the oldest Hindí, of Chand, I shall, for the present, retain the anuswára; as there may be some uncertainty as to the date, when the old anuswára of the Prákrit was changed by the Gaurian into the mere anunásika.

a Gen. सुवसस्स, but also सुवसणो; and similarly सुवसअं a Gen. सुवसअस्स or सुवसअणो. The latter form सुवसअणो might easily originate the Gaurian forms सोनअन, next सोनान, finally सोनाँ. This theory appears to receive some confirmation from the Marwāri where the *oblique form* of the pronouns generally ends in ण or the anuswāra, e. g., *his* is इणरा; it corresponds to the Hindī इसका; and as इस is a Prākrit genitive इस्स (see Essay 2nd), so perhaps इण is a corruption of a Prākrit genitive इणो (= Sanskrit इनः).*

Next we proceed to the Marāthī neuter nouns in ईँ. Their *oblique form* ends in या. E. g., मिरीँ *pepper* is derived from the Sanskrit मिरिचं; in Prākrit it is मिरिअं; in Gaurian मिरियं or, contracted, मिरीँ. The genitive of the Prākrit मिरिअं is मिरिअस्स or मिरिअस or मिरिअह. The last of these forms becomes in Gaurian मिरिआ or (contracted by Gaurian law) मिर्या which is the present Marāthī *oblique form* of the word. Again पाणीँ *water* is derived from the Sanskrit पाणीयं; this becomes in Prākrit पाणिअं (Pr. Pr. i, 18); and the latter changes in Gaurian to पाणीँ. The genitive of the Prākrit पाणिअं is पाणिअस्स or पाणिअस or पाणिअह, of which the last form changes in Gaurian to पाणिआ or पाण्या, the present Marāthī *oblique form* of the word. Again दहीँ *milk* is derived from the Sanskrit दधि; in Prākrit it is दधिं or दहिं or दहिकं or दहिअं. The last of these forms becomes in Gaurian दहियं, and this contracts into दहीँ. The genitive of the Prākrit दहिअं is दहिअस्स or दहिअस or दहिअह. The last of these forms changes in Gaurian to दहिआ, and is contracted into दह्या, the present Marāthī *oblique form* of the word. Again मोतीँ, *pearl* is in Sanskrit मुक्ता (or मौक्तिकं); in Prākrit it is मोत्ता or मोत्तिका or (diminutive) मोत्तिकं or मोत्तिअं. The last of these forms becomes in Gaurian मोत्तियं, and this contracts into मोतीँ. The genitive of the Prākrit मोत्तिअं is मोत्तिअस्स or मोत्तिअस or मोत्तिअह. The last of these changes in Gaurian to मोत्तिआ, and is contracted to मोत्या, the present Marāthī *oblique form* of the word.

There remain for consideration the Marāthī neuter nouns in एँ and the Hindī neuter nouns in ओँ, औँ, ऊँ. To these is to be added a Naipālī class of neuter nouns which I have only met with in the *oblique form* ending in या, and the *direct form* of which, I think, would probably end in ओँ or perhaps in ऊँ. A comparison of the passages, in which the Naipālī *oblique form* in या occurs, shows us the following points concerning them; 1., they are (adjective) nouns of agency; e. g., St. Luke viii. 5. एक बीउ छरन्या निस्को, *i. e.*, High Hindī एक बीज बनेवाला निकला; again इस अखपि ऊन्या लाइ देउ; *i. e.*, H. H. इस अखिवाले को दो; again St. Luke xxii. 21. सलाइ पक्राउन्या को हात, *i. e.*, H. H. मुझ को पकड़नेवाले का हाथ; again St. Luke xxii. 20, मरा वगन्या रगत को नचा घा हो; *i. e.* H. H. मेरे वहनेवाले रक्त के नाईँ है; again विखाउन्या दिन, *i. e.*, H. H. विश्राम का दिन. In the two last examples the *oblique form* is clearly an adjective (qualifying रक्त and दिन); but in the others also it is an adjective, though put by itself and thus used substantively.

* See, however, a note at the end of this essay.

Further in the first example we have it as a nominative ; in the second as a dative ; and in the fifth as a genitive. 2., These *oblique forms* belong to words which are equivalent to Hindí and Maráthí infinitives or gerunds ; this can be seen clearly by comparing the Hindí and Naipáli in the above examples ; compare also Naipáli जन्माउन्या दिन with Hindí जनने का दिन ; and Naipáli करन्या कौ प्रेरना with Maráthí करणा कौ प्रेरणा, etc. 3, These *oblique forms* are *genitives*. This may be seen from the fact that in the above examples विसाउन्या दिन and जन्माउन्या दिन the *oblique forms* विसाउन्या and जन्माउन्या are equivalent to the Hindí genitive विश्वास का, जनने का. Again सुनन्या in Naipáli is = सुननेवाला a hearer ; the plural of it is सुनन्याहेर, lit. hearer's multitude = सुननवाले का घेर. Here सुनन्या in the plural word is clearly in the genitive case. A little consideration will show, that, in fact, these *oblique forms* cannot be anything else but genitives. The words to which they belong are, as we have seen, infinitives, that is, verbal nouns expressing an act. On the other hand, the *oblique forms* themselves are, as we have also seen, adjective nouns of agency. Now the only way of turning a noun expressing an act, into a noun expressing an agent doing that act, is by putting it in the genitive case and supplying a common noun (as man) either expressed or understood. By doing this, the noun of act in the genitive case becomes equivalent to an adjective expressing the possession of the act by the supplied noun which is qualified by the adjective, e. g., सुनना is hearing ; and the genitive सुनने का, if मनुष्य man be supplied, (i. e., सुनने का मनुष्य or Naipáli सुनन्या मानिस), is a man of hearing, that is, a man who hears. Here सुनने का or सुनन्या is equivalent to an adjective. The word मनुष्य need not be expressed, and the adjective may be used by itself as a substantive noun of agency.

Now if these Naipáli *oblique forms* in या must be genitives, they can only be Prákrit (organic) genitives, modified, of course, by Gaurian phonetic laws. It has been already shown that the Gaurian infinitives or gerunds are identical with the Sanskrit or Prákrit future participles passive. And it can be easily shown that, according to the phonetic process explained in the beginning of this essay, the Gen. Sing. of the Prákrit will assume the Naipáli *oblique form* in Gaurian. E. g., to hear (the dhátu) is श्रु ; the Skr. Part. Fut. Pass. of it is श्रवणीय, in Prák. सुणणीञ्च or सुणणिञ्च ; the Prák. Gen. is सुणणिञ्चस्स or सुणणिञ्चास or सुणणिञ्चाह. The last form changes probably in late Prákrit to सुणणिञ्चा or सुननिञ्चा, and finally is contracted in Gaurian (by Sandhi according to Gaurian law) to सुनन्या, which is the present Naipáli form of the word.

This view of the Naipáli nouns of agency in या, is confirmed by the Bangáli, which possesses nouns of agency in अनीया and द्वा, as करनिया or करिवा doer (see Sama Churn Sircar's Grammar pp. 149., and 153.)* To the

* The forms in या and द्वाये, as करा and करिय doer are probably, merely contractions of those in द्वा and अनिया.

Naipálí सुनन्या *hearer* and the Hindí सुनने would correspond the Bangálí सुननिया; and to the Hindí form (in Braj Bháshá) सुनवे or सुनिवे or (in Marwári) सुनवा (the alternative Low Hindí forms of सुनने) would correspond the Bangálí सुनिवा. It is evident that the Bangálí nouns of agency in अनिया and इवा are derived from the two Skr. and Prák. Part. Fut. Pass. in अनीय and तव्य in the sense of the infinitive or of a noun expressing act; and that (as regards form) they are equivalent to the organic genitive of those participles, and thus came to signify the agent. Thus the Part. Fut. Pass. of the root श्रु (Prák. सुण) to *hear* is either सुणणीञ् (Skr. श्रवणीय) or सुणिञ्च्व or सुणिव्व (Skr. श्रोतव्य). The genitive of the former (सुणणीञ् or by Sandhí सुणणिञ्च) is सुणणिञ्चस्स or सुणणिञ्चास or सुणणिञ्चाह, of which forms the last changes in Gaurian to सुननिया, the present Bangálí form of the word. Again the genitive of the other Prákrit form सुणिञ्च्व or सुणिव्व is सुणिव्वस्स or सुणिव्वास or सुणिव्वाह, of which the last form changes in Gaurian to सुनिवा, the present Bangálí form of the word.

The Bangálí nouns of agency in अनिया and इवा (or इये and आ) and the Naipálí nouns of agency in या are, then, Prákrit genitives, or, looked at from the Gaurian standpoint, *oblique forms*; they all require, to complete their sense of agency, the supplement of some common noun (as मनुष्य man). This noun is, however, suppressed and in course of time the real genitive-nature of those nouns of agency was forgotten, and they came to be considered as regular original adjective or substantive nouns;* and, accordingly, to be declined as if their form were a nominative singular. Hence we meet in Naipálí with a genitive सुनन्या को, Dat. सुनन्या लाइ, as if सुनन्या were the Nom. Sing. e. g., St. Luke xxii. 21.; तर देख सलाइ पक्राउन्या को हात मेरा सँग माँच माथि छ, (*i. e.*, H. H. मेरे पकड़नेवाले का हाथ, etc.); or St. Luke xix. 24. दस अखपि ऊन्या लाइ देउ (*i. e.*, H. H. दसअथफिवाले को दो). Similarly in Bangálí the nouns of agency may be declined. In illustration of this phenomenon, I may refer to a parallel one in German. Some of the modern German surnames are the Latin genitive of original Christian names; but now they are considered and are declined as regular original nouns in the nominative case. E. g., such names as *Jacobi*, *Georgii* are really genitives to which filius “son” is to be added; *Jacobi* meant originally, the son of Jacob; *Georgii*, the son of George; and they are declined as *Jacobis philosophic*, the philosophy of *Jacobi*, as if *Jacobi* were a nominative. Similarly such names as *Stevens* are really genitives; for *Stevens* is properly *Steven’s* son.

* A very similar phenomenon happened in the formation of the *direct form* of the plural in some Gaurian languages; e. g., Naipálí सुनन्याहेर *hearers* (lit. hearer’s multitude) corresponds to Hindí सुननेवाले, where some noun like घेर must be supplied. Thus Naipálí भोकाहेरpl. of भोको *hungry* = Hindí भूके (or complete भूके घेर). This will be fully discussed in a future essay on the inflexional base of the Plural.

We must return now to the examination of the Maráthí neuter nouns in एँ and Hindí neuter nouns in औँ, औँ, ऊँ. The oblique form of the Maráthí neuter nouns in एँ ends in या; that of Hindí neuters in औँ, औँ, ऊँ ends in ए. E. g., *done* in Maráthí is केलेँ, oblique form केल्या; in old Hindí it is कियेँ or कोनैँ oblique form कोये or कीने;—*high* is in Maráthí उच्चेँ, oblique form उच्चा; in (High) Hindí ऊँचा (Braj Bháshá ऊँचैँ, old Hindí उँचैँ), obl. form ऊँचे;—*doing* is in Maráthí करणेँ, obl. form करणा, in Hindí (Braj Bh.) करनैँ, obl. form करने, etc., etc. Here we see that the Hindí terminal ए always stands in the place of a Maráthí terminal या. Now if we put together this fact with the other fact, already stated, that in Gaurian the syllable या (or अय, इय, etc.) is often contracted into the diphthong ए; and also with the fact noticed before, that the Naipálí *oblique form* in या corresponds to the Hindí oblique form in ए, (as Naipálí करन्या to Hindí करने); the conclusion must necessarily be drawn, that the terminal ए of the Hindí *oblique form* of nouns is a contraction of an original termination या; and this will apply not only to the termination of the oblique form of Hindí neuter nouns, but also to that of Hindí masculine nouns in औ or आ; for, e. g., the Hindí masculine noun (घोड़े or) घोड़ा *horse* is identical with the Maráthí (घोड़े or) घोड़ा; and the oblique form of the latter घोड़ा must also be identical with the oblique form of the former घोड़े; and so forth.

The next question is, what is the origin of this original termination या of the Gaurian *oblique form* of neuter nouns in औँ, औँ, ऊँ, एँ, and their corresponding masculine nouns. Here the infinitives afford us again a clue to its right interpretation. A Hindí infinitive is, e. g., करनैँ *to do*; we have seen, it is derived from the Prákrit करणीञ्च. Now करणीञ्च changes in the Nom. case successively into करणिञ्च, करणञ्च, करनैँ or करनूँ. In the genitive case it changes successively from करणीञ्चस्स, करणिञ्चस्स to करणिञ्चास्स करणिञ्चाह, करणिञ्चा, करन्या, करने. And thus by phonetic changes, perfectly regular, natural and easy, we arrive at the *direct form* in औँ and ऊँ, and the *oblique form* in ए of the Hindí neuter nouns. And the conclusion we draw, is that the termination या of the Gaurian *oblique form* is a contraction of the termination इञ्चस्स of the Prákrit genitive; and this is the case also with all Hindí neuter nouns which are not infinitives. E. g., the oblique form किये of the neuter noun कियेँ *done* must represent a Prákrit genitive किइञ्चस्स (for किट्कस्स = Skr. कृतकस्य), which must have changed successively into किइञ्चास्स, किइञ्चाह, किइञ्चा, किया, किए or किये (with euphonic य). Perhaps at first sight there will seem to be a difficulty in this theory. In the case of the infinitive करनैँ both the *direct form* in औँ and the *oblique form* in ए were traceable to an original Prákrit base in इञ्च; on the other hand, as regards all other Hindí neuter nouns in औँ or ऊँ (as, e. g., कियेँ, etc.) their *direct form* in औँ is derived from a Prákrit base in अञ्च; while, if the theory be correct, the *oblique form* in ए must be derived from a Prákrit base in इञ्च. In other words the theory necessitates

the assumption that Prákrit bases which in the nominative case ended in अञ्च changed or deteriorated in the genitive case into इञ्च.* To illustrate this, let us take again the case of कियैँ done. Its *direct form* represents a Prákrit nominative किदकं, which changed successively into किञ्चञ्च, किञ्चैँ or किञ्चैँ, कियैँ. The *oblique form*, as we have just seen, postulates a Prákrit genitive किदिकस्स, that is, the Prákrit nominative किदकं or किञ्चञ्च with a base in अञ्च, has a genitive किदिकस्स or किदइञ्चस्स with a base in इञ्च. Now though this change may surprise at first sight, there is really nothing irregular or extraordinary in it. It is a phenomenon which under certain phonetic circumstances regularly occurs. I have had occasion already to notice that the base termination अञ्च (अक) has a tendency to degenerate into इञ्च (इक) or उञ्च (उक). Thus we have in the Mirchchhakati केरिञ्च besides केरञ्च; and विदुञ्चो for विस्विकः, etc.† But the change has become an absolute rule in the feminine. Bases which in the masculine end in अक (अञ्च) change always in the feminine into a base ending in इक (इञ्च), and this rule obtains already in Sanskrit; e. g., Skr. masc. बालकः *boy*, but fem. बालिका *girl*; Prákrit masc. बालञ्चो, fem. बालिञ्चा, etc. The reason of this change, probably, is that, as the ultimate in the feminine is heavily weighted (by changing अ to आ), the penultimate is lightened (by changing अ to इ). Now under exactly the same circumstances the same change evidently takes place in the later or vulgar Prákrit declension of bases in अक. Take again the example of किदक. The Nom. sing. is किदको. The Gen. किदकस्स or किदकास or किदकाह or किदका. At this stage, I think, the change must have taken place; the form किदका would correspond exactly to an original feminine form बालका; and as the latter changed to बालिका, so the former changed to किदिका, and for the same reason; because the ultimate had become आ for अ, the penultimate was shortened to इ for अ. Next किदिका or किदइञ्चा changed to किय्या; and this to किए or किये. This theory applies equally to Hindí masc. nouns in ओ or आ. Take, e. g., घोड़ा *horse*. It is derived from the Prákrit base घोडक or घोडञ्च, which in the feminine becomes घोडिका or घोडिञ्चा. The Nom. Sing. of the Masc. is घोडको or घोडञ्चो, which in Gaurian is contracted into घोडे and changed to घोड़ा. The Gen. Sing. of the masc. is घोडकस्स or घोडञ्चस्स, which changes successively to घोडञ्चास, घोडञ्चाह, घोडञ्चा, घोडिञ्चा, घोड्या, which is the present Maráthí *oblique form*, and finally to घोड़े, which is the present Hindí *oblique form* of the word.

There is another explanation possible of the Hindí *oblique form* in ए which is not open to the difficulty just now discussed. But it is open to

* It should be noted, however, that, as explained previously, the Hindí infinitive termination औँ or ऊँ requires a change of the original Prákrit termination इञ्च to अञ्च; so that, practically, there is no difference in this respect between Hindí infinitives and other Hindí neuter nouns.

† See also some more examples in the note 5 on page 105.

other difficulties ; not only to *one*, but several, which moreover are more serious and much less capable of being surmounted. The explanation is this. The Gaurian diphthong ए can be not only a contraction of या, but also of अया. If we suppose the latter to be the case in the Hindí *oblique form* in ए there is no necessity of assuming a change of the Prákrit base termination अय into इय. In this case the *oblique form* in ए (e. g., किये) is to be explained thus ; the Prákrit genitives किङ्कस्स or किअयस्स change to किअयास्स to किअयाह or किअया. At this stage, as I have shown on former occasions, the word passed into Gaurian, and, according to Gaurian rule, either Sandhi must take place, or a euphonic letter must be inserted, to prevent hiatus. The question is, which of these two alternatives happens. According to the present theory we must assume that the euphonic letter य् was inserted. Hence we get किअया which finally changes to किए or किये. So far there is no difficulty ; on the contrary it obviates the difficulty involved in the other theory of changing the base in अय into one in इय. But there is positive evidence to show that of the two alternative cases just now mentioned, not the one here assumed (*viz.*, insertion of य्), but the other (of Sandhi) took place in reality. In Marwári, namely, the *oblique form* is not किये but किया, and what this fact indicates is this, that in the form किअया when it passed into Gaurian, not the insertion of a euphonic consonant य, but *Sandhi* of the hiatus-vowels (अ and या) took place ; *viz.*, किअया was contracted into किया or (with euphonic य्) किया. Evidence of the same fact is the Naipáli and Gujaráti with their *oblique form* in या, which, as I have already shown, is the contraction of a terminal form अया ; e. g., Gujaráti सोणुँ gold, obl. form सोना ; equivalent to Prákrit Nom. sing. सुवसअँ and Gen. sing. सुवसअस्स, or सुवसयास, or सुवसयाह, or सुवसया, and contracted सोना. It follows from all this that if the Prákrit base in अय remained unchanged in the process of transition of the Prákrit into Gaurian, the termination of the Prákrit genitive was contracted by *Sandhi* into या, and not changed, by the insertion of a euphonic य्, into अया ; and hence the origin of the termination ए must be differently explained. And the explanation is, that there was an alternative case ; in some places the Prákrit base in अय remained unchanged, and gave rise to the *oblique form* in या ; in other places the Prákrit base in अय was weakened to इय, and thus gave rise to the *oblique form* in या or ए. E. g., the base सुवसअ gold remained unchanged in Gujaráti and its genitive सुवसया (for सुवसअस्स) was contracted to सोना ; while in Hindustán, it was weakened to सुवसिय, and its genitive सुवसिया was contracted to सोन्या or सोने.

The objection explained in the preceding remarks is only one of the reasons against the derivation of the termination ए of the Hindí *oblique form* from an original termination अया. I shall now proceed to state a few more reasons against it, in order to remove as much as possible, all doubts as to the truth of the theory, that the termination ए stands for या, and this for इया (= इका).

2. A second reason is this. To the Hindí *oblique form* in ए the Maráthí *oblique form* in या corresponds and both must have an identical derivation. Now though ए may be explained as a contraction of अया in Hindí, this cannot be done with Maráthí या. In Maráthí the initial consonant य् of the syllable या is always compounded with the final consonant of the base. There does not seem to be any trace that it may be separated from the final consonant of the base, and pronounced as अया; e. g., the *oblique form* of घोड़ा *horse* is घोड़ा, but not घोड़ा. In the case of the *oblique form* in वा, the *Manual* admits an alternative form in अवा; e. g. तारु *ship*, obl. form तारवा or तारवा; but in the case of the *oblique form* in या neither the *Manual*, nor Dadobas's Grammar, nor any other grammar that I have consulted, admits an alternative form in अया. If it had existed at all, it would surely have been mentioned by one or other of the grammars. Even the alternative form अवा is doubtful, seeing that it is only mentioned by the *Manual*; but the alternative अया, it appears, does not exist at all. Now this fact would be very improbable on the supposition that the form in अया is the original one, out of which the other (the present) form in या arose by the suppression of the medial अ. Such a suppression of a medial अ, indeed, is not uncommon in Gaurian; but whenever it occurs, both forms remain equally current, the original one without the suppression and the derived one with the suppression; and at all events, whatever the pronunciation may be, the spelling wherever accuracy is observed, follows the origin of the word. Thus in Hindí, though *he knows* is pronounced jántá it is always by correct Nágari writers spelled jánatá (*i. e.*, जानता, not जान्ता). Now neither of these is the case with the Maráthí *oblique form* in या; it is always *spelled* with the य् compounded with the preceding consonant, and always so *pronounced*. Even if we should rely on the analogy of the *oblique form* in वा, it would not help us out of the difficulty. For, as I have shown formerly when treating of the Maráthí neuter nouns in ऊँ, the case is just the reverse with the obl. form in वा. There the original form is that in वा and the derived form is that in अवा, *i. e.*, with the insertion of a euphonic अ to prevent the necessity of pronouncing a compound consonant; such insertion being also not uncommon in Gaurian. If, therefore, the analogy of the *oblique form* in वा proves anything, it proves the very thing demanded by my theory; *viz.* that the form in या is the *original form*; and if a form in अया should exist, it could only be a vulgar corruption of the form in या with *inserted* अ. Further, it should also be noted, that even if two alternative forms in या and अया should exist, this fact, though it might allow the opposite theory, would in no way contradict my theory; (for the form in या, as just shown, might be the original one); while if only *one* form in या exists, this fact is altogether fatal to the opposite theory, but accords entirely with my theory. It seems certain, then, that, at all events in Maráthí, the termination या of the obl. form is original, and not reducible

to a form in अया. But if this is the case, the Hindí corresponding termination ए must also be a contraction of an original termination या, and not अया. And further it follows, that both in Maráthí and Hindí, the Prákrit base from which this oblique form in या and ए is derived, must have ended in इया.

3. In Maráthí there is one exception to the rule that the initial consonant य of the obl. form termination या is compounded with the final consonant of the base. It is the gerund in आवेँ. According to both the *Manual* (see § iii, III.) and Dadoba's Grammar (see §. 463.) the *oblique form* of these gerunds does not end (as we should expect according to the analogy of other neuter nouns in ऐँ, as करणें [obl. form करणा], उच्चें [obl. उच्चा]) in आव्या, but in आवया; e. g., करावेँ to do, obl. form करावया (not कराव्या), जावेँ to go, obl. form जावया (not जाव्या). Here the alternative form in व्या does not exist at all. Now this exception proves the rule extremely well. It has been observed several times already that these Gaurian gerunds or infinitives in आवें are derived from the Skr. and Prák. Part. Fut. Pass. in तव्य, and it has been shown in a previous place, that the Sanskrit termination तव्य may become in Prák. अवयं; thus Skr. कर्तव्यं becomes Prák. (करिअव्यं or) करिअवयं or करअवयं. The genitive of the latter form is करअवयस्स, which changes to करवयास or करअवयाह or करअवया. Here the form passes into Gaurian which, according to its law, contracts the form, by Sandhi of the hiatus-vowel, into करावया; and thus we obtain the present Maráthí *oblique form*. Now let it be noted that here the semivowel य् is not a euphonic insertion of the Gaurian, but an original, integral part of the word, taken over from the Prákrit. The case would be very different with any other neuter nouns, as e. g., उच्चें high. In Prákrit this neuter would be उच्चअं, which in Gaurian would become उच्चयं; the genitive of the Prákrit उच्चअं would be उच्चअस्स or उच्चआस or उच्चआह or उच्चआ, in which last form it passes into Gaurian, and now if we are to obtain the form उच्चया, we must assume that the Gaurian inserts a euphonic य्. This, as we have seen, is not the case; the Gaurian, on the contrary, makes Sandhi under these circumstances; we should obtain the form उच्चा. We see, therefore, that the reason why the *oblique form* of the Gerund in ऐँ differs from the *oblique form* of other neuters in ऐँ, is this, that the consonant य् of the former is organic, while the य् of the other neuters would be an inorganic euphonic insertion. But, as I have proved by examples from the Gujarátí, Naipálí and Marwáří, it is contrary to the habit of Gaurian to insert य् in this particular case; it prefers to make Sandhí. Hence the difference under discussion proves, that the oblique form in या must be explained in an altogether different way, and the theory advanced by me, that it is the modified genitive form of a Prákrit base in इय् fulfils all the requirements of the case.

4. The *oblique form* in या is not altogether peculiar to Maráthí neuter nouns in ऐँ, but it belongs also to the Maráthí neuter nouns in ईँ. Now

the *oblique form* of the latter originated, as I have shown formerly, from the genitive of Prákrit bases in इञ्; and, as there is no reason to suppose that the *oblique form* in या of the neuter nouns in एँ differs in nature from it, the former must also be derived from the genitive of Prákrit bases in इञ्. E. g., दहीँ *curds* has the oblique form दह्या, *i. e.* दहिञ्चा = दहिञ्चाह = दहिञ्चास = दहिञ्चस्स (दधिकस्य), which is the Gen. sing. of a base in इञ्. Similarly सोन्या, the obl. form of सोनेँ *gold*, must be सोनिञ्चा = सुवणिञ्चाह = सुवणिञ्चास = सुवणिञ्चस्स = (सुवणिकस्य), *i. e.*, the Gen. sing. of a base in इञ्.

There can be little doubt, then, I think that the Maráthí *oblique form* in या postulates a Prákrit base in इञ्, and so also the Hindí *oblique form* in ए, which is evidently identical in nature with the former. And I may here add, that this is true also of the Panjábí *oblique form* in ए which is identical in nature and form with the Hindí obl. form in ए. In consequence, it must be assumed that while the *direct form* in एँ, औँ, औँ, ऊँ, of neuter nouns is derived from the nominative Sing. of a Prákrit base in अञ्, the oblique form in या of the same nouns is derived from the genitive Sing. of a Prákrit base in इञ्, into which the Prákrit base in अञ् degenerated in the course of transition into Gaurian, in consequence of the final of the word having become heavily weighted in the genitive.

5. Moreover in Hindí, there is one instance which affords us positive evidence of the fact, that the obl. form termination ए is equivalent to या, and not to अया. The *oblique form* of the *proximate demonstrative pronoun* in the Braj Bháshá, is या; on the other hand in Ganwárí it is ए. E. g., *in this* is in the Braj Bháshá यामेँ, in the Ganwárí एमे; *of this* resp. is याको and एकर; *to this* याकोँ and एको, etc. There can be no doubt that the Ganwárí ए is merely a contraction of the Braj Bháshá या. This is easily confirmed by a further comparison of the Ganwárí and the Braj Bháshá. It has been already remarked that in Gaurian या is often contracted to ए, वा to ओ, य to इ, and व to उ. Now the Braj Bháshá *oblique form* of the *distant demonstrative pronoun* is वा and this, in the Ganwárí, is represented by ओ; e. g., Braj Bháshá has वाको, वाकोँ, वामेँ; but the Ganwáरी ओकर, ओको, ओमे. Again while the Braj Bháshá has यहाँ *here*, वहाँ *there*; the Ganwáरी has इहाँ and उहाँ.

There is still a point remaining for settlement concerning these neuters; *viz.* the Prákrit original of the final एँ of the *direct form*. The Maráthí final एँ corresponds to the Hindí final औँ, औँ, or ऊँ (High Hindí आ); e. g., Maráthí सोनेँ *gold* is equal to Low Hindí सोनैँ or सोनूँ (H. H. सोना); Mar. केलेँ *done* is = Hindí कियैँ (H. H. किया); Mar. करणँ *doing* = Hindí करनैँ or करनूँ (H. H. करना), etc. The terminations औँ, ऊँ, there can be no doubt, are the modifications of the Prákrit terminal form अञ्. It is, therefore, *primá facie* probable, that the Maráthí एँ is also a modification of the Prákrit termination अञ् into अयं by inserting य, which अयं afterwards contracted into एँ. But this is merely Gaurian law; and the existence of

neuters in अयं in early Gaurian has been already amply proved. But there are two circumstances, which would seem to indicate a different derivation of the Maráthí final एँ; viz. from a Prákrit final इञ्च, which in early Gaurian would become इयं (with insertion of euphonic य्). Those two circumstances are; 1. that the original of the termination एँ of the Maráthí gerunds in ऐँ (or नेँ) is the Prákrit termination इञ्च, (e. g., करणे *doing* is contracted from Prákrit करणिञ्च), and that by parity, all Maráthí-neuters in एँ are derived from Prákrit neuters in इञ्च. 2, that as the *oblique form* in या of these neuters in एँ is derived from the genitive of a Prákrit base in इञ्च; if we derive the *direct form* in ए from the nominative Sing. of a Prákrit base in इञ्च, all difficulty attending the derivation of the oblique form is removed. Though it must be admitted, that these reasons are of considerable force, yet I think, the reasons which decide for the other view outweigh them. These are, 1., that it equalizes the derivation of the neuter nouns which are common to both Maráthí and Hindí; while the Prákrit termination अञ्च (old Gaurian अयं) would explain easily the Gaurian neuters ending in औँ, ऊँ, as well as एँ, the Prákrit termination इञ्च would only explain the Maráthí ending एँ, but not the Hindí ending औँ or ऊँ, for which we would have to keep the Prákrit termination अञ्च. 2., There is the Maráthí neuter termination ईँ which, to a certainty, is contracted from the Prákrit neuter termination इञ्च; if the Maráthí neuter termination एँ be also taken as a contraction of the Prákrit termination इञ्च, there is no intelligible reason, why in some words the ending इञ्च should have been contracted into ईँ and in others again into एँ. On the other hand, there is a very good reason for this difference, if we suppose that originally neuter nouns ended partly in अयं, partly in इयं; and those ending in अयं contracted their final into एँ, while those ending in इयं contracted it into ईँ. E. g. सोनेँ *gold* is contracted from the Prákrit सुवणञ्च, old Gaurian सोनयं; but दहीँ *curds* is contracted from the Prákrit दहिञ्च old Gaurian दहियं.—3., Again to anticipate a point which will be fully gone into in the next essay; to the Maráthí neuters in एँ correspond Maráthí masculines in आ; now according as the Maráthí neuter in एँ is derived from an original form in अयं or इयं; the masculine in आ must also be derived from an original form in अओ (अयो) or इओ (इयो); but the form अओ yields much more readily the contraction आ (old Maráthí ओ), than the form इओ, the latter could in the first instance give us only the contracted form ओ; and though there is perhaps no absolute difficulty in assuming a contraction of ओ to ओ (as in उओ to उओ *high*),* still it is not so easy and natural as the

* In illustration might be adduced the High Hindí participle past passive in आ, for the Braj Bháshá ones in औ; as H. Hindí कहा, for Braj Bháshá कह्यौ. Here कहा may have arisen by the elision of य् in कह्या. But its origin may also have taken place in a different manner. The corresponding participles in Maráthí end in अला, which stands for the Skr. ending इत; e. g. *read* is पढला, the Skr. is पठितः; the

contraction of अओ to ओ (as in उचओ to उचो).—4., while on the theory of the Prákrit terminal form अअ being the original of the Maráthí terminal form एँ, the two objections to this theory (noticed above) can be reconciled; on the other hand, on the theory of the Prákrit termination इअ being the original, the three objections to this theory are incapable of being surmounted. As regards, namely, those two objections, it may be said: 1, that the ending एँ of the Maráthí gerunds in ऐँ (or नेँ), though, no doubt, ultimately derived from a Prákrit termination ईअ or इअ may well be proximately derived from a Prákrit termination अअ. For it has been shown already that the Prákrit Part. Fut. Pass. affix अणोअ may change to अणिअ (or अणियं) or अणअ (or अणयं).^{*} And this derivation

Prák. (with the amplificative affix क) पढिदको or पढिदओ; in the more vulgar and broad Prák. dialect it must have become पढदओ, this changed to पढडओ and finally to पढलओ; in Gaurian it was contracted to पढलो or पढला. We may well suppose that the affix इत was also in Hindí sometimes broadened in अत. Hence Skr. कथित would become in Prák. कहिदको or कहदको. The latter form would change to कहअओ or कहओ or कहो or कहा which last is the High Hindí form of the word. The former form would change to कहिअओ or कहिओ or कह्यो or कह्यौ which last is the Braj Bháshá form of the word. The extreme improbability of the Prákrit termination इओ being contracted in Gaurian first to यो, next to ओ or आ is illustrated by the word मूषिक mouse, which becomes in Gaurian मूसा or मूसो. Here the Gaurian termination आ or ओ might be thought to be a contraction of the Sanskrit termination इकः or Prákrit इआ. But if we turn to Prákrit, we find the following sūtra in Subha Chandra's grammar, अपथिष्टथिवीप्रतिश्रुद्धिभीतकहरिद्रायाम् (II, 47, corresponding to Hema Chandra I, 88.); that is, the first इ of the words mentioned in the sūtra changes to अ; hence the Skr. मूषिकः becomes in Prákrit मूसओ, and this, now, changes in Gaurian to मसो or मूसा.

* The insertion of a euphonic य, which, as has been remarked in another place, has become one of the phonetic laws of Gaurian, is not altogether unknown to the later Prákrit. Thus Hema Chandra in his Prák. grammar gives the following sūtra अवर्णा यश्रुतिः I, 180, in Subhachandra the corresp. sūtra is यश्रुतिरः III, 5, and the commentary thereon कगादिलोयेऽवर्णात् परो योऽवर्णोऽवशिष्यते तत्र लघुप्रयत्नतरयश्रुतिर्भवति, which means, that if a consonant which is preceded by अ or आ and is followed by अ or आ is elided, a euphonic य is inserted; some examples given are सयडं (for शकटं), तित्थयरो (for तीर्थकरः), रथयं (for रजतं), etc. This sūtra limits the practice to a particular case. But in Gaurian there is no limitation; and there are not wanting evidences that even in later Prákrit the limitation was not strictly observed. Thus Hemachandra himself in his commentary to sūtra I, 14, of his own grammar makes the following remark बडलाधिकारादीषत्सृष्टतरयश्रुतिरपि, that is, by the rule of variety the semivowel य may be slightly pronounced, and he gives among others as an example सरिया fer Skr. सरित्. Also in the previously mentioned sūtra he mentions as an exception पियद् for Skr. पिवति. In all MSS., in my possession, both of his grammar and that of Hema Chandra the euphonic व is generally inserted in the Prákrit examples; while in the MSS. of Vararuchi's Prákrit Prakásha it is never met with.

is rendered almost certain by the fact, that the Hindí equivalent of the Maráthí gerundial ending अणेँ is अनौँ or अनूँ which can only have arisen from a Prákrit ending अणञ्चं. Thus the Maráthí करणेँ corresponds to the Hindí करनौँ or करनूँ. Now the *proximate* original of the Hindí form करनौँ or करनूँ must have been a Prákrit form करणञ्चं; hence it is probable that it was also, in the form करणञ्चं, the original of the Maráthí form करणेँ; though the *ultimate* original of both forms (Hindí as well as Maráthí) was the Prákrit form करणीञ्चं or करणिञ्चं. Moreover the word पाणीँ *water*, which is a contraction of the Prákrit form पाणिञ्चं or पाणीञ्चं,* shows plainly, that if the Prákrit termination अणीञ्चं was modified to अणिञ्चं or अणञ्चं, it changed its final in Gaurian according to rule into ईँ, and not to एँ; and that, therefore, in order to explain the change of the ultimate Prákrit form अणीञ्चं to अणेँ in Maráthí, we must assume, that first it was modified to अणञ्चं and afterwards अणञ्चं to अणेँ.—2., It has been proved already that there is nothing extraordinary or irregular in a change of a Prákrit base in अञ्चं in the Nom. Sing. to a base in इञ्चं in the Gen. Sing.

The conclusion, then, which we must draw, appears to be this, that the termination एँ of Maráthí neuters is in all cases of substantives (as सोनेँ), adjectives (as उच्चेँ), and participles (as केलेँ), and probably in the case of gerunds (as करणेँ) a contraction of the old Gaurian termination अञ्चं and the Prákrit termination अञ्चं.

In order to complete the subject of the neuter inflexional base, I may add, that in the modern literary form of the Hindí-class Gaurian languages (excepting Gujarátí) the final anunásika of the neuter *direct form* of the inflexional base is always dropped. Thus in High Hindí we have करन for the Braj Bháshá करनौँ and Alwarí करनूँ.† Again compare पाणी *water* with Maráthí पाणीँ, and High Hindí अलू *potatoe* with Maráthí अलूँ; this is but the legitimate conclusion of a regular phonetic process affecting the final nasal. In Sanskrit we have final म्; in Prákrit final म् is toned down to the anuswára; in Gaurian the anuswára is attenuated to the anunásika; and in modern literary Gaurian finally the anunásika is dropped. The result of this process is the disappearance of the neuter gender in the modern literary Hindí-class Gaurian languages (excepting Gujarátí); for by the dropping of the final anunásika the neuter and the masculine become identical and indistinguishable in form; and hence were also not distinguished in gender.

It was remarked above when treating of the Maráthí neuters in ऊँ that the formation of the final ऊँ took place, as it were, on the confines or the debatable ground between Prákrit and Gaurian; and that, therefore,

* See Hema Chandra I, 101. Śubha Chandra II, 59.

† Similarly the Dative post-position in High Hindí is को for Braj Bháshá कौँ.

neuter nouns in ऊँ may be considered and treated as well as *Prákrític* as *Gaurian proper*. This remark applies with equal force to neuter nouns in ईँ. In Maráthí these neuter nouns in ऊँ and ईँ are *generally* considered as *Prákrític*, and treated accordingly; *i. e.*, have an *oblique form* (as पणीँ *water*, obl. form पाण्या; अलूँ *potato*, obl. form अल्वा). But in the Hindí-class Gaurian languages, they are always considered as *proper Gaurian* and treated accordingly, *i. e.*, have no *oblique form* (as Hindí, Gujarátí, etc. पाणी *water*, अलू *potatoe* remain unchanged throughout the declension).

The next essay (No. V) will be devoted to the examination of the inflexional base of the masculine and feminine nouns with reference to the proof of these two points; that the *oblique form* is identical with the *Prákrític* genitive, and that the termination ओ or आ of the *direct form* (of masculine nouns) is owing to its original being the termination of a *Prákrític* base, formed by means of the pleonastic affix क. This will also afford an occasion to examine an old Hindí *oblique form* in हि or ह and the inflexional base of the pronouns.

APPENDIX.

A table exhibiting the various stages of phonetic decay of the nominal forms in the development of Gaurian from Prākṛit and Sanskrit.

A. DIRECT FORM.

Sanskrit.		Theoretical or (vulgar Skr.?)	Prākṛit.		Gaurian ¹ .	
Base.	Nom. Sing.		Early.	Late or vulgar.	Old.	Modern.
Bases in ५	सुवर्णे	सुवर्णम्	सुवर्णञ्	सोसञ्	{ सोनो (or सोनवं?) सोनयं.....	सोनो B. सोना H. सोनुं G. सोने M.
	पिल्ल	पिल्लम्	पिल्लञ्	पिल्लञ्	पिल्लो (or पिल्लवं?)	पिल्लो B. पिळ्ळू M. पिल्ला H.
	मुक्ता	मुक्ता	सोत्तिञ्	सोत्तिञ्	सोत्तियं	सोती M. सोती H.
	स्पर्श	स्पर्शः	फंसञ्	फांसुञ्	फांसुवं or फांसो	फांसू M.
	पिटक	पिटकम् or पेटकम्	पिडञ् or पेडञ्	पेडुञ्	पेलुवं or पेलो	पेलू M.
Bases in ५	दधि	दधि	दहिञ्	दहिञ्	दहिञ्	दही M. दही H.
	अशु	अशु	अंसुञ्	अंसुञ्	अंसुवं or अंसो	अंसू M. अंसू H.
Bases in ५	गडु	गडु	गडुञ्	गडुञ्	गलुवं or गलो	गलू M.

		Sanskrit.		Theoretical or (vulgar Skr ?)		Prākṛit.		Gaurian ¹ .	
		Base.	Nom. Sing.			Early.	Late or vulgar.	Old.	Modern.
Gerund in कृत्वा	करणीय	करणीयम्	—	करणीञ्	करणिञ् OR करणञ्	करणियं OR करणयं (करणं (करनवं?))	करणियं OR करणयं (करणं (करनवं?))	करणे M. करणे B. करणू A. करणु N. करणा H.	
	पानीय	पानीयम्	—	पाणीञ्	पाणिञ् OR पियणिञ् ⁶ OR पियणञ्	पाणियं पीणयं पीनां (पीनवं?))	पाणियं पीणयं पीनां (पीनवं?))	पाणो M. पानी H. (water) पीणे पीनां B. पीनू A. पणु N. पीना H. } drink.	
Gerund in कृत्वा	कर्त्तव्य	कर्त्तव्यम्	कर्त्तव्यम्	कर्त्तव्यञ् OR कर्त्तव्ययं ² OR कर्त्तव्ययं	कर्त्तव्यञ् (कर्त्तव्यञ् OR कर्त्तव्यञ् कर्त्तव्ययं	कर्त्तव्यं करिवं (करिववं?) करवो (करववं?) करावयं	करिवो B. करिवू A. करवो B. करवू A. करवु G. करावो M.		
	मिरिच	मिरिचम्	—	मिरिचञ्	मिरिचञ् जुञ्चं जुञ्चञ् कुञ्चं ³	मिरियं जुवं OR जो जुञ्चो (OR जुञ्चवं?) कुञ्चं कुञ्को	मिरिो M. जुं M. जुञ्चो B. जुञ्चा H. कुञ्चं M.		
Miscellaneous	युग	युगम्	—	युगञ्	युगञ् (युगकम् कुङ्कमम्	—	—	—	
	कुङ्कम	कुङ्कमः	कुङ्कमम्	कुङ्कमञ्	कुङ्कमञ्	—	—	—	

B. OBLIQUE FORM.

सुवर्णे	सुवर्णस्य	सुवर्णकस्य	सुवर्णस्य OR सुवर्णस्यस्य OR सुवर्णस्यस्यस्य (सुवर्णस्यस्यस्य?)	सोष्ण ⁴ OR सोष्णस्य	सोना सोन्या	सोना G. सोन्या M. सोने H.
पित्त	पित्तस्य	पित्तकस्य	पित्तस्य OR पित्तस्यस्य मोक्तिस्य OR मोक्तिस्यस्य	पित्तस्य OR पित्तस्यस्य मोक्तिस्य OR मोक्तिस्यस्य	पित्ता पित्त्या सोत्या	पित्ता M. पित्त्ये H. सोत्या M.
स्यर्ष	स्यर्षस्य	स्यर्षकस्य	फांसस्य OR फांसस्यस्य	फांसस्य OR फांसस्यस्य	फांसा	फांसा M.
पिटक OR पेटक	पिटकस्य OR पेटकस्य	पिटकस्य OR पेटकस्य	पिटस्य OR पेटस्य	पेटस्य OR पेटस्यस्य	पेत्वा	पेत्वा M.
दधि	दधिनः	दधिकस्य	ददिस्य OR ददिस्यस्य	ददिस्य	दद्या	दद्या M.

Bases in ५

Bases in ५

Sanskrit.		Theoretical or (vulgar Skr. ?)		Prākṛit.		Gaurian ¹ .	
Base.	Nom. Sing.			Early.	Late or vulgar.	Old.	Modern.
अश्रु गडु	अश्रुणः गडुनः	अश्रुकस्य गडुकस्य		अंशुआस OR अंशुआह गडुआस OR गडुआह	अंशुआ गडुआ	अंसा गल्वा	अंसा M. गल्वा ⁵ M.
करणीय पानीय कर्त्तव्य	करणीयस्य पानीयस्य कर्त्तव्यस्य	— — करितव्यस्य		करणीआस OR करणीआह पाणीआस OR पाणीआह करिव्यआह — OR —	करणिआ पाणिआ OR पियणिआ करिवयाह OR करिवआह करिवआ OR करवयाह OR करवआह करवआ करववया	करणा पाणा OR पीणा करिवया करिवा करवया करवा करवया	करणा M. करने H. पाणा M. (water) पीणा M. पीने H. (drink) करिवे B. करिवा MR. करवे B. करवा MR. करवया M.

Bases in ७

Gerunds in अनाय and नय

मि॒रि॒च	यु॒ग	मि॒रि॒च॒स्य	—	मि॒रि॒त्रा॒स OR मि॒रि॒त्रा॒ह	मि॒रि॒त्रा	मि॒रि॒या	मि॒रि॒या M.
कु॒ङ्ग॒म	यु॒ग॒स्य	कु॒ङ्ग॒म॒स्य	{ यु॒ग॒स्य OR यु॒ग॒क॒स्य	जु॒ञ्ज॒आह जु॒ञ्ज॒आह	जु॒ञ्ज॒आ OR जु॒इ॒त्रा	ज्वा	ज्वा M.
कु॒ङ्ग॒म	कु॒ङ्ग॒म॒स्य	—	—	कु॒ङ्ग॒मा॒स OR कु॒ङ्ग॒मा॒ह	कु॒ङ्ग॒आ **	जु॒या कु॒ङ्का	जु॒ए H. कु॒ङ्का G. कु॒ङ्का M.

Miscellaneous.

NOTES TO APPENDIX.

Note 1.—M. = Maráthí ; B. = Braj Bháshá ; A. = Alwar dialect ; N. = Naipáli ; G. = Gujaráti ; MR. = Marwári ; H. = High Hindí.

Note 2.—The Prákrit grammars allow only those forms of this gerund, which change the compound consonant **य** into **व्व** (see Pr. Prák. VII, 33) ; as करिअव्वं or करेअव्वं, to which Hemachandra adds also करिव्वं and करेव्वं. But the Gaurian dialects seem to postulate two more Prákrit forms of that gerund ; viz. such as change the comp. cons. **य** into **विय** or **वय** ; and such as change the connecting vowel **इ** into **अ** (see my note on p. 83, 84) ; e. g., besides करिअव्वं also करिअवियं or करिअवयं or करअवयं. Now since writing the present essay, I have found that my conjectures are supported by the Páli of the rock inscriptions ; e. g., in the Dhauri inscription occurs the form कटविय and in the ordinary Páli कातव्वं or कत्तव्वं besides करितव्वं (see Dr. Muir's Skr. Texts, Vol. II., p. 113, and Dr. Mason's Páli Grammar, p. 90). This is all the more important, as, no doubt, the Páli of the inscriptions represents much more closely the *spoken* language than the Prákrit of the grammars, which may have sacrificed sometimes the established but irregular forms of popular usage to the uniformity and regularity of a fancied rule.

Note 3.—The forms कुंकुअं and कुंकुआ I have given on the analogy of two sūtras in Śubha Chandra's Prákrit Grammar (Adhy. I, Páda I, sūtra 14. 15.) : डित् आनुनासिकम् ॥ *i. e.*, whenever the technical letter ड is added, an anunásika must be pronounced ; and मोड यमुनाचामुण्डातिमुक्तककामके ॥ *i. e.* in the (four) words yamuná, chámunḍá, atimuktaka, kámuka स् must be pronounced as an anunásika ; e. g., जडुणा, काडुओ, etc. Perhaps we may assume, that in later and vulgar Prákrit the elision of consonants generally was compensated by the pronunciation of anunásika ; and this conjecture might afford us another explanation of the puzzling final anunásika of the neuter *oblique form* in Gujaráti and Panjábí. E. g. if the elision of क् should be compensated by anunásika, we should have the Gen. सुवसँआह for सुवर्णकस्य ; and सुवसँआह would change to सोसँआ, and finally to सोनाँ. This explanation, perhaps, appears less forced than that given above in the text p. 85, 86.

Note 4.—In the text (see above p. 60) I have explained that the Prákrit Genitives in आह, as सोणआह, drop the final ह, and change to सोणआ. In support of this theory compare the remarks of Beames in his Comp. Gram. of the Modern Aryan languages of India p. 259., which I have received in the meanwhile. The only example given there is Skr. कर्पास which in Panjábí is कपाह, but in Oríya कपा. A still more apposite evidence of my theory has since occurred to me in the Gaṇwári (Hindí) *oblique form* of the *near demonstrative pronoun* which is ए or एह and corresponds to the Braj

Bhášhá form या or याहि. The original, namely, is the pronominal base इम which is defective in Sanskrit, but in Prákrit has a complete declension. The Gen. Sing. of इम is in Prákrit इमस्स or इमास or इमाह, in which, in later Prákrit, the म becomes changed to anunásika, thus इँआह (see note 3). Finally the form इँआह becomes in Gaurian contracted (by sandhi) to एह which is Ganwári, or to याहि which is Braj Bhášhá. At the same time it is manifest, that the alternative forms ए and या must be contractions of an original Prákrit form इँआ (with apokope of ह). Similarly the *oblique form* of the second personal pronoun in the Ganwári is तो or तोह, in Braj Bhášhá तो or तोहि. The original of these forms is the Prákrit genitive तुमस्स (nom. तुमं), or तुमास or तुमाह or (in late Prákrit) तुँआह or तुँआ. Of the two last forms the former तुँआह is contracted to तोह; the later तुँआ to तो. And so forth; the pronouns offer many more illustrations.

Note 5.—The Maráthí गलूँ *boil*, might be also derived from the Sanskrit गण्ड; which might be preferable, as the Skr. गण्ड means *boil*, while गडु does not exactly. In illustration of the change of the Skr. ण्ड to ल, I may quote the word कुम्भाण्डी which according to Śubha Chandrá sūtra II, 80. changes in Prákrit to कोहंडी or कोहली. If this derivation be correct, then गलूँ is another example of the change of the termination अक to उक; for its proximate original will, then, be गण्डुकं. I may here add a few more examples of the change of the termination अक to इक or उक in Prákrit which have occurred to me since writing the foregoing essay. They have not always been recognized as such by Prákrit grammarians. E. g., in Śubha Chandra sūtra अमृद्गादौ वा (II, 8. corresp. to Hema Chandra I, 44), it is said among the examples that पावासू is a modification of the Sanskrit प्रवासी; and again in his sūtra उर्द्धिनि प्रवासीदौ (II, 53. corresponding to Hema Chandra I, 94, 95) it is said that by the change of इ to उ the Sanskrit प्रवासी becomes in Prákrit पवासुओ. It is manifest, that the Prákrit पवासुओ or contracted पवासू (or पावासू) is not a modification of the Sanskrit प्रवासी (of the base प्रवासिन्) but of a Sanskrit form प्रवासकः. Again Śubha Chandra has a sūtra वाद्र्मयटि (II, 20, corresponding to Hema Chandra I, 50), according to which the vowel अ of the affix मय optionally changes to अइ; the example given is धम्ममइओ for Sanskrit धर्ममयः; that is, according to the Prákrit grammarian's theory the Skr. धर्ममयः changes to धम्ममइयो or, with elision of the medial य, धम्ममइओ. This is evidently a fanciful theory. The truth, no doubt, is that the Sanskrit base धर्ममय is, by adding the affix क, amplified to धर्ममयक and then weakened to धर्ममयिक; the latter form naturally yields the Prákrit form धम्ममइओ (by eliding य् and क्). Again Śubha Chandra has a sūtra सर्वज्ञादौज्ञोणेच (II, 18, corresp. to Hema Chandra I, 57), according to which, if the comp. cons. ज्ञ is changed to ण, the inherent vowel अ becomes उ; thus Skr. सर्वज्ञः becomes in Prákrit सव्वणू. Now the form सव्वणू presupposes an original base सर्वजु, but there is no such base in Skr. ;

but सर्वज्ञ would be naturally amplified to सर्वज्ञक, and this might very well be modified to सर्वज्ञुक, which would yield a Prákrit form सव्वसुओ or contracted सव्वसू. It should be noted, that all the words referred to here, are such in which the forms in इक and उक are confined to the Prákrit, while in Sanskrit they occur only in the form in अक. But there is a not inconsiderable number of Sanskrit nouns in अक (*i. e.* अ + affix क) which have, *in Sanskrit itself*, alternative and equivalent forms in इक and उक. Now considering that most of these forms in इक and उक occur only *rarely* and in *late* Sanskrit works, I think we are justified in concluding that, a., they are merely phonetic modifications of the original form in अक (*i. e.*, not formed by a separate and original Skr. affix इक or उक, which is the common opinion); b., that originally they were peculiar to Prákrit, having originated by Prákrit phonetic law; and c., that they have been retransferred from Prákrit into Sanskrit (a theory regarding the relation of Prákrit and Sanskrit which admits perhaps of wider application, than is generally thought). If this view be correct, the number of those cases where a Skr. base in अक has undergone in Prákrit a modification into इक or उक, will be very much enlarged. As to the prevalence of the addition of the affix क (resp. इक) in Prákrit, see the testimony of Dr. J. Muir in *Sanskrit Texts* Vol. II, p. 122, and Dr. Weber in *Fragment der Bhagavatí*, I. ster Theil, pp. 437, 438.

Note 6.—The Gaurian verb, पीना *to drink*, must be derived from the reduplicated root पिव (for पा), which, probably, was much more extensively employed in colloquial Prákrit than either in Skr. or literary Prák. The Prák. Gerund of पिव would be पिवणीञ्चं or पिवणिञ्चं, or (with elision of व्) पिञ्चणिञ्चं, or with insertion of euphonic य (espec. mentioned by Hema Chandra I, 180, Śubha Chandra III, 5), पिचणिञ्चं, or (broadened) पिचणञ्चं. This latter form would be contracted in Gaurian regularly to पीनयं (old G.), पीने^० M., पीनौ^० B., पीना H.

Note.—I withdraw, for the present, the remarks on the Skr. Past Part. Act. affix इतवान् on page 67.